

AE
5
H44
1890
SLRA

SMITHSONIAN
LIBRARIES





7248
C123

SELECTION OF ARTICLES

CONTRIBUTED TO THE

NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPÆDIA

BY

M. HEILPRIN.

PRINTED FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION.

CONTENTS.

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| CYRUS. | FRANCIS JOSEPH. |
| CZARTORYSKI. | FREDERIC WILLIAM II., III., AND IV. |
| CZERNY GEORGE. | GAUL. |
| DEMETRIUS (PSEUDO). | GÖRGEY. |
| DEMETRIUS PHALEREUS. | HANNIBAL. |
| DEMETRIUS POLIORCETES. | HEBREWS. |
| DEMETRIUS SOTER. | HUNGARY.* |
| DEMIDOFF. | KOSSUTH. |
| FRANCIS II. OF FRANCE. | MEDIA. |
| FRANCIS I. AND II. OF GERMANY. | POLAND. |

* The sketch of the Language was contributed by the late Dr. KRAITSIR.

and prophecy, the emperor's attempt to rebuild in the holy city the Jewish temple. The edict of the emperor Valens in the year 367, repealing Julian's act of amnesty, again sent Cyril into exile, and only after 11 years was he able to regain his seat and to stay unmolested. He had the satisfaction in the last years of his life of seeing the orthodox faith fully established, and of taking part in the council of Constantinople, which decreed the condemnation of the Arian, semi-Arian, and Macedonian heretics.—The writings of Cyril which remain are: a course of 23 "Catechetical Lectures;" a single sermon, suggested by the Scripture narrative of the healing of the paralytic, and treating sin as the origin of all misery and suffering; and a letter to the emperor Constantine relating the prodigy of the luminous cross at Jerusalem. His works have been frequently printed both in Greek and in Latin. The editions of Cologne (1564) and Paris (1589) are in a single octavo volume. The fine edition of the Benedictine Toutée (Paris, folio, 1720) is in both languages. A French translation of the "Catechetical Lectures," with notes and commentaries, was made by Grandeolas. An English translation of the same work, very faithful and spirited, edited by John Henry Newman, was published in Oxford in 1838.

CYRUS, the ancient name of a river in Asia. See KOOR.

CYRUS. I. THE ELDER, the Koresh of the Hebrew Scriptures (supposed to be from the Persian *kohr*, the sun), the founder of the Persian empire, reigned from 559 to 529 B. C. He was grandson of Astyages, king of Media. This is one of the few particulars of his life about which the various testimonies of antiquity agree, most others being differently related in the histories of Ctesias and Herodotus, and in the Cyropædia of Xenophon. But as Ctesias is in general little trustworthy, and as Xenophon seems to have written his book, a kind of philosophical romance, for moral or political purposes, and without much regard for history, the story of Herodotus, in spite of its legendary character, has been generally adopted by modern historians down to Grote. According to this narrative, Cyrus was the son of Cambyses, a Persian noble, and of Mandane, the daughter of Astyages. This king commanded him to be put to death immediately after his birth, in consequence of some dreams which were explained by the magi as presages of the future royal greatness of the child. Saved by the humanity of Harpagus, an officer of the court, and of a herdsman, who was to expose him to death in the wilderness, he was brought up by the latter, as his son, in a secluded mountain region, where he soon became the leader of his playfellows, who chose him as their king. Having in this capacity ordered the son of a distinguished Median to be scourged for disobedience, he was brought before Astyages, to whom his bold answers and his features soon betrayed his origin. The herdsman was pardoned, Harpagus cruelly pun-

ished in the person of his son, and Cyrus, whom the magi declared to have already attained the threatening greatness predicted by the dreams, was sent to Persia to his parents. When he grew up, following the secret advice of Harpagus, he prepared to dethrone his grandfather. The Persians, a poor, hardy, and warlike people, were easily induced to shake off the yoke of Media; Harpagus betrayed the first army, sent under his command against the rebels; and with a second, the king himself was defeated near Pasargada, and made prisoner (559). Cyrus was acknowledged by the Medes as ruler of the new empire of Persia and Media, of which they became the second nation. He now marched against Cræsus, the rich and mighty king of Lydia, who crossed the Halys to revenge his fallen ally and brother-in-law Astyages. A bloody battle was fought in Cappadocia, but with an indecisive result. Cræsus, however, thought it wiser to return to his own country, hoping to recommence the campaign with reinforcements from his allies, the kings of Egypt and Babylonia, and the Lacedæmonians. But before these arrived, Cyrus had in his turn crossed the Halys, vanquished the celebrated Lydian cavalry on the plain before Sardis, taken that city, and made Cræsus his prisoner. The Greeks of Asia Minor, who had rejected the previous invitations of Cyrus to revolt against the Lydians, were now conquered by an army under Harpagus. A part of the Phocæans, however, preferred the dangers of an emigration to the distant regions of the west to a peaceful subjection. The Carians, Carians, Lycians, and others were next subdued by the same general, while Cyrus himself was preparing and partly executing his more important eastern conquests. For the reduction of Babylonia, the 2d great empire of western Asia, by Cyrus, we have the concurring testimony of the 3 above mentioned Greek historians, as well as of the Scriptures, though, according to Xenophon, he acted only as general of his uncle Cyaxares II., son of Astyages, king of Media. Herodotus describes in his way how, on his march from the north-east against Babylon, Cyrus chastised the river Gyndes, an affluent of the Tigris, for drowning one of his sacred white horses, by digging 360 channels. "so that women in future should cross it without wetting their knees;" how he turned the Euphrates by a canal into the artificial lake made by the Babylonian queen Nitocris, "on which the river sank to such an extent, that the natural bed of the stream became fordable;" how through this bed the Persians entered the city and took it by surprise; and how, "owing to the vast size of the place, the inhabitants of the central parts (as the residents at Babylon declare), long after the outer portions of the town were taken, knew nothing of what had chanced, but as they were engaged in a festival, continued dancing and revelling until they learned the capture but too certainly." Confirming these statements, the Hebrews dwell with pleasure

on the exploits of their deliverer from the Babylonish captivity; on the "one from the north" and "from the rising of the sun," who comes "upon princes as upon mortar, and as the potter treadeth clay," who executes "on Babylon the vengeance of the Lord," "that saith to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers; that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid" (Isaiah). They delight to relate how "the mighty men of Babylon have forborne to fight, they have remained in their holds, their might hath failed; they became as women;" how one post runs "to meet another, and one messenger to meet another, to show the king of Babylon that his city is taken at one end" (Jeremiah). After the fall of the capital (538), which seems to have been greeted by many oppressed nations of Asia as the commencement of an era of justice and freedom, all the provinces of the Babylonian empire speedily surrendered to the conqueror, who was now master of nearly all the countries between the Indus and the Ægean, the Oxus and the Red sea. Satisfied with this vast dominion, which he ruled wisely and justly, Xenophon makes him die in peace and in his bed with a Socratic speech on his lips; but Arrian attributes to him afterward an invasion of India across the desert of Arachosia; Ctesias, an expedition against the Derbices, a people in the Caucasian regions, in which he is slain; and Herodotus, an attack upon the Massagetæ, northern nomades ruled by a queen, Tomyris, and greatly resembling the Scythians, in whose country he was defeated and slain in a bloody battle. Tomyris, who revenged the death of her son, filled a skin with human blood, Herodotus adds, into which she dipped the head of Cyrus, thus giving the insatiable conqueror, as she said, his fill of blood. There is, however, some testimony to the allegation that he was buried in Pasargada in his native province, "where his tomb was honored and watched until the breaking up of the empire, while his memory was held in profound veneration among the Persians." "There is much reason to believe," says Rawlinson, "that the tomb of Cyrus still exists at Murgab, the ancient Pasargada. On a square base, composed of immense blocks of white marble, rising in steps, stands a structure so closely resembling the description of Arrian, that it seems scarcely possible to doubt that it is the tomb which in Alexander's time contained the body of Cyrus. It is a quadrangular edifice or chamber, built of blocks 5 feet thick, which are shaped at the top into a sloping roof. Internally the chamber is 10 feet long, 7 wide, and 8 high. There are holes in the marble floor, which seem to have admitted the fastenings of a sarcophagus. The tomb stands in an area marked out by pillars, where occurs repeatedly the inscription (written both in Persian and the so-called Median): 'I am Cyrus the king, the Achæmenian.'

It is called by the natives the tomb of the mother of Solomon." II. CYRUS THE YOUNGER, 2d son of Darius Nothus, king of Persia, received from his father at an early age the satrapy of Lydia, Phrygia, and other parts of Asia Minor (407 B. C.). When his elder brother, Artaxerxes II., ascended the throne (404), he formed a plot against his life, which was discovered by Tissaphernes, and pardoned on the intercession of Parysatis, the widow of Darius. Reinstated in his satrapy, Cyrus succeeded in collecting a powerful army, including 13,000 Greek mercenaries, and marched from Sardis in the spring of 401 toward Babylonia, with the secret purpose of dethroning his brother. Having crossed the Euphrates at Thapsacus, he met the king at the head of an immense army, near Cunaxa. The battle was nearly won, especially by the valor of the Greeks on the right wing, when, perceiving Artaxerxes in the centre, the ambitious prince furiously rushed to assail him, and fell pierced by a javelin, after having wounded his brother. The character and accomplishments of this prince are painted in the brightest colors by Xenophon, in the 1st book of the Anabasis.

CYTHERA. See CERIGO.

CYZICUS, one of the oldest and most powerful of the Greek cities of Asia, situated on a small island in the Propontis, near the Mysian shore, is said to have been founded by a Pclagic tribe, expelled from their homes by the Æolians. It was afterward subject alternately to Athens, Sparta, and Persia, and obtained its independence after the time of Alexander. In the wars which determined the fate of the kingdom of Syria it took part with Pergamus and the Romans against Antiochus. The heroism with which the Cyzicenes defended their city when it was besieged by Mithridates obtained for it the rank of a *libera civitas*. When Constantine created the new province of Hellespontus, he made Cyzicus the capital. It was partially destroyed by an earthquake in A. D. 443, and was captured and completely ruined by the Arabians in 675. The place is now overgrown with neglected orchards and vineyards, and a low sandy isthmus has been formed, converting the island into a peninsula.

CZACKI, TADEUSZ, a Polish financier and author, born in 1765, at Poryck, in Volhynia, died at Dubno, Feb. 8, 1813. At an early age King Stanislas Augustus appointed him to an office in the royal tribunal of Warsaw, where the regulation of the secret archives of the Polish sovereigns was intrusted to him. From 1788 to 1795 he was a member of the Polish board of the treasury. He was also employed by the committee which discussed the constitution of May 3, 1791, of which he was a staunch supporter. When the second division of Poland took place, his property was confiscated, but afterward restored by Paul I. In the latter part of his life he devoted himself to the interests of education. His views met with the approbation of Alexander, and the gymnasium of

of 1656, with the assistance of 5,000 Tartars, he defeated them in 4 battles, brought back the king in triumph, and turned his arms with similar success against the Transylvanians. The dignity of palatine of Red Russia, and the title of "Liberator of Poland," were his reward. In 1658 he marched to the assistance of Frederic III. king of Denmark, who had invaded the German possessions of Sweden; he conquered the island of Alsen, took the command against the Russians, hastened to Lithuania, and won 2 great victories at Polonka, near Slonim, June 26, 1660, and on the banks of the Dnieper, over Chavanskoi and Dolgorouki. Peace was now conquered with Sweden (1660), and Moscow (1661). Having been made *starosta* of Tykocin, he undertook to chastise the Cossacks, who, incited and supported by the Russians, had again commenced their devastations (1663); and in order to procure the assistance of the Tartar khan he set out with only 13 horsemen, following the course of the Dniester, hastened through Bessarabia and the Ukraine to the Crimea, and defeated the Cossacks at Czehryn (1664), and Stawiszcz (1665). But these exertions exhausted him; returning to Tykocin, he could not be carried beyond the village of Sokolówka, where he died in a peasant's hut, having received a few days before the staff of hetman of the crown. In 1760 John Clement Branicki, his descendant, caused a statue to be erected to his memory.

CZARTORYSKI, the name of a Polish princely family, whose origin is traced back to Korygiello or Constantine of Tchernigov, son of Olgierd, duke of Lithuania, and half brother of Jagiello, the founder of the dynasty of that name in Poland (1386). The name is derived from the dominion of Czartorya, and the place Czartorysk near Luck in Volhynia. Of the 2 branches of the family, which belongs to the highest rank of nobility in their country, and boasts of a number of statesmen equally remarkable for wealth, talents, and patriotism, the male line of the younger branch, that of Korzek, became extinct in 1810, while the elder, that of Zukow, is still flourishing in a number of conspicuous persons of both sexes. To this elder branch belong the following historical persons: I. MICHAŁ FRYDERYK, born in 1695, died at Warsaw, Aug. 13, 1775. He was made castellan of Wilna in 1720, vice-chancellor of Lithuania in 1724, and great chancellor of that duchy in 1752. Together with his brother and other nobles, he formed an influential party, which strove to bring about a reform of the constitution of Poland, which would strengthen the influence of the king and the judiciary, and restrain the anarchical independence of the high dignitaries of the crown. Their chief object was to change Poland into a hereditary kingdom, if possible under a Czartoryski. To counterbalance the influence of the reigning house of Saxony, as well as that of Austria, they courted the assistance of Russia, which by means of gold and bayonets, however, finally decided the matter in its own favor. II. AU-

GUST ALEXANDER, brother of the preceding, born in 1697, died at Warsaw in 1782. He was palatine of Red Russia, and lieutenant-general of the army of the crown. He was a zealous coöperator with his brother, but was deceived in the expectation of seating his son upon the throne of his country. By activity and happy speculations he added greatly to the wealth of the family. III. ADAM KAZIMIERZ, son of the preceding, born Dec. 1, 1731, at Dantzic, died March 19, 1823, at Sieniawa in Galicia. He was chosen by the party which was headed by his father and uncle as candidate for the royal dignity after the death of Augustus III. (1763). To gain the assistance of Russia, Stanislas Poniatowski, whose mother was a sister of the 2 elder Czartoryskis, was sent to the court of St. Petersburg. But the empress Catharine II. determined to put the crown of Poland upon the head of her favorite Poniatowski himself. This determination being known, Czartoryski yielded his pretensions to his happier rival, to whom from his early youth he had been attached as a friend. At the assembly of the nation preceding the election, the Czartoryskis and their adherents appeared in great numbers at Warsaw, and together with them an army of Russians, sent to support the claims of Poniatowski. Adam Kazimierz was chosen marshal or president of the diet in spite of patriotic opposition roused by the presence of the Russians, and Poniatowski was elected king. After the first partition of Poland in 1772, Czartoryski, who possessed large estates in Galicia, accepted the commission of a general of artillery in the Austrian army, but still adhered to the party which worked for the restoration of the power of Poland through a constitutional reform, and distinguished himself by his zeal and activity at the long diet, which proclaimed the liberal constitution of May 3, 1791. He was also active in persuading the elector of Saxony to accept the hereditary succession to the crown of Poland, and Austria to engage in an alliance against Russia. But all these attempts failed; the confederation of Targovitz against the new constitution was assisted by the arms of Russia, Poniatowski deserted the cause of the reform, and in 1793 a new partition of Poland ensued. Czartoryski now retired and lived at Vienna during the great rising under Kosciuszko (1794), whom he persuaded not to extend the insurrection over the frontiers of Austria; which, however, did not prevent that power from taking its share at the final dismemberment of Poland in 1795. He took no part in the events which followed the treaty of Tilsit, and the creation of the duchy of Warsaw by Napoleon (1807); but in 1812 he accepted the marshalship of the confederation, preceding the invasion of Russia, which promised the restoration of ancient Poland. This illusion, however, soon vanished; Napoleon wanted the Poles, but no Poland, and the fatal issue of the great campaign foiled every hope. Czartoryski retired to Pulawy, but in 1815 headed a depu-

tation to the congress of Vienna, and presented to the emperor Alexander the outlines of a new constitution for the kingdom of Poland, now reorganized under his sceptre. Alexander made him senator palatine. IV. ELZBIETA, wife of the preceding, born countess of Flemming in 1743, died in Galicia, June 17, 1835. She was distinguished by beauty, spirit, and patriotism, but also inclined to romantic extravagance. Having spent several years at court, and in travels in western Europe, which brought her into contact with the most remarkable personages of the age, she retired to Pulawy, where she constructed the admirable gardens of which Delille sings in the didactic poem *Les jardins*, and the temple of the sibyl, containing a collection of relics of Polish history. She was also active in promoting industry and education. She published "Ideas on the Construction of Gardens" (Breslau, 1807), and the "Pilgrim in Dobromil" (Warsaw, 1818), a popular book on national history, for the instruction of the agricultural class. Having survived the 3 partitions and 2 restorations of Poland, she proved her patriotism in the revolution of 1830-'31, but had the mortification to see her seat at Pulawy bombarded by her own grandson, the prince of Würtemberg, who served in the Russian army. She passed her last years with her daughter in Galicia. The collections of Pulawy were in part dispersed, and in part transported to St. Petersburg. V. MARYA ANNA, daughter of the preceding, born March 15, 1768, died at Paris, Oct. 24, 1854. In 1784 she was married to Louis Frederic Alexandre, prince of Würtemberg, but as he betrayed the cause of Poland in 1792, she left him and was divorced. Her mother in one of her letters characterizes her in these words: "A heavenly soul, an angelic character, a charming figure, talents, virtues, and many misfortunes—this is her history." In 1816 she published a romance, *Malwina*, which was translated into several languages. After the revolution of 1830-'31 she retired to Galicia. The estates of the Czartoryskis in the kingdom of Poland having been confiscated, her only son Adam, prince of Würtemberg, who had served against the Poles, offered her a pension, which she rejected in the following words: "Sir, I have not the honor of knowing you; I have no longer a son, and care little for fortune." VI. ADAM JERZY, brother of the preceding, born Jan. 14, 1770, completed his education in France and at the university of Edinburgh, fought bravely in 1792 against the Russians, in the Lithuanian army under Zabiello, and was sent in 1795 to the court of St. Petersburg, as a hostage for the fidelity of his family. There, being attached to the person of the grand duke Alexander, the future emperor, he became his intimate friend. In 1792 he was sent by the emperor Paul as ambassador to the court of Sardinia, whence he was recalled in 1802 by his successor Alexander, to assist him in the department of foreign affairs. This situation, which he accepted, and

used for the benefit of his country, drew upon him a great deal of envy and patriotic censure on the part of some of his countrymen, which, however, his conduct gradually overcame. On April 11, 1805, he signed for Russia the alliance with England, and accompanied Alexander in the campaign in Austria, where he was present at the battle of Austerlitz. He also followed him to the campaign in Prussia, and after its termination to the conferences of Tilsit in 1807. The duchy of Warsaw having been created by the treaty then concluded, he left the service of the emperor and lived retired from public affairs till 1813, when he again accompanied Alexander to Germany; France, and the congress of Vienna. Made senator palatine of the new kingdom of Poland by Alexander, he appeared at its first diet, acting in behalf of liberal ideas. In 1821 he resigned the curatorship of the university of Wilna, which he had held since its organization in 1803, in consequence of the extraordinary persecutions to which a number of students, accused of conspiracy, had been subjected. The report of his successor Novosiltzoff, who accused him of having delayed for a century, through his management, the amalgamation of Lithuania with Russia, was an honorable testimony to his patriotism. He now more and more won the confidence and esteem of the nation, and after the outbreak of the revolution of Nov. 29, 1830, he was called to preside over the provisional government. He convoked for Dec. 18 the diet which proclaimed the independence of Poland, Jan. 25, 1831, when Czartoryski became president of the national government. This dignity, in which he sacrificed immense riches on the altar of the revolution, he laid down after the terroristic scenes of Aug. 15, to serve as a private soldier in the ranks of the army under Ramorino. After the surrender of that general in Galicia, and the fall of Warsaw (Sept. 1831), he shared the fate of the Polish emigration in France. He was excluded from the amnesty of 1831; his estates in the Russian Polish provinces were confiscated; those in Austria were sequestered in 1846 in consequence of a declaration in favor of the revolutionary movement which drove the Austrians from Cracow, but were restored in 1848. In March, 1848, he issued a proclamation calling upon the representatives of Germany and France to unite for the restoration of Poland. In April of the same year he abolished serfdom on his estates of Sieniawa. Being the choice of the monarchical party in the Polish emigration, and as such distinguished by some too zealous adherents with honors not convenient for an exile, Czartoryski was often the object of violent attacks on the part of the democrats, but together with his wife, Anna, princess of Sapieha (born in 1796), sustained his dignified position by a nearly regal munificence, which made his hotel in Paris a place of refuge for his suffering compatriots. He has 2 sons, WITOLD, born in 1824, and WLADYSLAW, born in 1828, and a

Threatened with the vengeance of the sultan, they resolved to obviate it by the massacre of all the leading Servians, which they executed in part in February, 1804. George and many others escaped and found refuge in the mountains, where they were soon joined by hosts of outlaws, ready to revenge the blood of the Christians. A general insurrection was prepared. George was urged by his companions to become its leader, but, conscious of his ignorance, for he could neither write nor read, he refused, declaring himself incapable of government. "We'll assist you with our advice," was their reply. "But I am of a violent spirit," said he; "instead of judging, I shall order men to death." "Well, in our circumstances we want rigor." George yielded, and did his best. He laid siege to Belgrade; his lieutenants took several strongholds of the janizaries. Sultan Selim, who was pleased with these victories over the seditious janizaries, ordered Bekir Pasha of Bosnia to aid the Servians. The janizaries were unable to resist the double attack; their chiefs took to flight, but were overtaken and beheaded. But instead of returning to their peaceful occupations, the Servians, emboldened by their success, continued in arms, sent a deputation to Alexander, the emperor of Russia, and, on his promise to support their claims, another deputation to Constantinople, asking that all the strongholds of the country should be surrendered to them, and a compensation paid for the losses they had suffered. George in the meanwhile attacked and took the last strongholds of the janizaries in the southern part of the country. These proceedings irritated the sultan; he ordered Hafiz, the pasha of Nissa, to march to Servia and disarm the insurgents; but being resisted by George, at the head of 10,000 men, the pasha speedily retired. In the spring of 1806 Servia was invaded by Bekir Pasha from the west, and by Ibrahim, pasha of Scutari, from the south. Thus pressed, George first strengthened his precarious position by the massacre of suspected national leaders, marched against the Bosnians, routed them, and then turned against Ibrahim, who had been checked in his course by one of his lieutenants, and was now ready for a cessation of hostilities. This was approved of by the sultan, who terminated the negotiations of peace by granting the Servians the national independence of their country under the suzerainty of the Porte, with the obligation to pay an annual tribute. But the execution of the stipulations still had to be enforced; Belgrade, Szabacz, and other places, were to be taken by assault, and these conquests were stained by wanton massacres of Mohammedans. In the summer of 1807 the Servians became masters of the whole of their country. George was elected its chief, and as such acknowledged by the Porte; but he had to struggle against the independent spirit of the military chiefs, and the opposition of the senate, many members of which leaned toward Russia, while he disliked

that power. He overcame the difficulties by energy and rigor, which had the merit of being impartial. His only brother, having committed an outrage on a girl, was hanged, and his mother forbidden to mourn for him. This illustrates the character of this barbarous hero, of whom a tradition relates that in his youth, when he first determined to leave the country of his oppressors, he shot down his father, who refused to follow him. Generally he was gloomy and taciturn, but wine made him talk and even dance. He was simple in his habits; his dress was like that of other peasants; he himself performed the hardest labors of a husbandman, and his daughter, like other peasant girls, brought water from the well. But cruelty and avarice stained both his life and administration. In 1809 the war of Alexander against Turkey seemed to George a favorable opportunity for extending the limits of his country and reconquering its ancient possessions and power. Crossing the south-western mountains to unite with the Montenegrins, he laid siege to Novibazar, and then made an attempt to conquer the Herzegovina, when he was surprised by the rout of his lieutenants by an invading Turkish army. The intervention of a Russian corps alone saved Servia, but in the following year George was again successful, and repeated victories also secured for him an almost absolute power, which easily crushed every opposition. The divan now offered him propositions of peace, which he rejected, generously refusing to treat without his Russian allies; but Russia, threatened in its existence by Napoleon, hastened to conclude the treaty of Bucharest (1812), whose stipulations in behalf of Servia proved illusory. Thus suddenly deserted, George lost his wonted energy, sought for peace instead of preparing for a vigorous resistance, and made humiliating proposals. Even these were rejected, and the Turkish army entered Servia in June, 1813. Veliko, the Achilles of Servia, who tried to check their march, was killed by a cannon ball, and on Oct. 2 George allowed the Turks to cross the Morava before his eyes. Eager to save his life and treasures, he fled the next day beyond the Danube, and sought refuge in Semlin, and subsequently in Chocim in Bessarabia. The deserted Servian troops disbanded, and the Turks were again masters of Servia, which but slowly recovered a partial independence under the lead of Milosh Obrenovitch. In 1817, when the Greek Hetairia was secretly preparing a general insurrection in the northern provinces of the Ottoman empire, George was tempted to leave his retreat, and to return in secret to Servia. Having succeeded in reëntering it undetected, he repaired to the house of Vuitza, one of his ancient lieutenants, whence he besought Milosh to raise the banner of insurrection. But the new national ruler, cautious and afraid of a rival, informed the pasha of Belgrade of his presence, and that official demanded his head. The demand was complied with, Vuitza surrendered him, and the head of the man

Samozvanietz, or the Pseudo Demetrius, and is generally believed to have falsely assumed the name of the younger surviving son of Ivan the Terrible, who during the reign of the elder son, the feeble Fedor, was confined by Boris Godunoff, the brother-in-law and ruler of the czar, in the town of Uglitch, and died there in 1591 a violent death, which was attributed by his mother to the treachery of Boris. The young prince was found in his blood, the knife with which he had been playing in his throat; some visitors from the court were pointed out by the lamenting mother as the murderers, to the gathering people of the place, who, fanatically revering the house of Rurik, and hating the usurper, rushed upon the strangers and massacred them. Boris took fierce revenge for this insult on the people and town of Uglitch, and ample testimony was procured to prove before his tribunal that Demetrius died accidentally. His despotic though energetic reign before and after the death of Fedor, the last of the Ruriks (1598), had prepared the minds of the Russians for a rebellion, when rumors of Demetrius having escaped the hands of the assassins by the substitution of another victim spread over the country. The pretender, whose real name and origin are still a mystery, made his first disclosures in 1603 at the court of Prince Adam Wisniowiecki in Lithuania, where he was serving in the capacity of a page. Prince Constantine Wisniowiecki, the brother of Adam, introduced him to his father-in-law, Mniszek, palatine of Sandomir. Some of the Polish nobles and their friends were gained by the persuasive skill of the pretender, others were incited by hopes of adventures or gain to support him, while Mniszek was fascinated by the prospect of seating upon the throne of Russia his beautiful and ambitious daughter, Maryna, for whom the youth declared his love. An audience of the king, Sigismund III., was easily gained, and, the interests of both the state and the Catholic church decisively pleading in favor of the cause, the nobles were allowed to set on foot an expedition to Moscow, independently of the government. The future czar was zealously assisted by the Jesuits, whose influence had now begun to be of great weight in the councils of Poland, and some historians, therefore, suspect him to have been the *élève* and tool of the order. A simultaneous revolt of the Russian Cossacks against the rule of Boris, under the lead of Grishka (Gregory) Otrepieff, a runaway monk, seconded the enterprise. The menaced prince, in order to degrade his rival, identified him with the leader of the Cossacks, a statement which afterward misled some intelligent writers. The invading army, about 5,000 strong, was reinforced in Russia by detachments of Cossacks. Some of the strongest cities, summoned in the name of the son of Ivan, voluntarily opened their gates; others were taken. Novgorod Seversk alone, defended by Basmanoff, successfully checked their march, thus effectually assisting the operations of the opposing army.

Having vanquished Prince Mstislavski in Dec. 1604, the pretender was in his turn defeated by the same general in Jan. 1605, and pressed back to Pootivl; but the sudden death of Boris by apoplexy or poison soon terminated the war. Basmanoff, made commander of the army by his son and successor, Fedor, came into the camp of the enemy to implore his mercy. A deputation from Moscow offered to surrender the capital, the new czar and his family were surprised in the Kremlin and thrown into prison, and the victor entered Moscow in triumph amid the shouts of the people (June, 1605), and was crowned as Czar Demetrius. Fedor and his mother had been murdered, perhaps by his command; other members of the unhappy family also were made victims of his cruelty or policy, but a daughter of Boris was spared to become his concubine. The widow of Czar Ivan was now brought forth from the convent, in which she had so long been secluded, and her tears and embraces gave public sanction to the identity of the new czar with her son Demetrius. His reign was marked from the beginning by vigor and energy as well as ability; but his love of innovations, his undisguised predilection for the culture, institutions, and even religion of Poland, and his often expressed contempt of the customs, superstitions, and barbarous ignorance of his subjects, soon made him the object of national hatred. The arrival of his foreign spouse, with a large and pompous train of Polish nobles, warriors, and Jesuits, the arrogant and reckless behavior of some of these followers, and rumors of the czar's intended apostasy from the Russian church, finally undermined his throne. A few days after the celebration of his nuptials with Maryna, and her coronation, a band of conspirators, led by Prince Shuiski, who was indebted to Demetrius for the generous pardon of a former plot, assaulted the Kremlin. Demetrius found some faithful defenders, and evinced extreme boldness in the defence of his life, but in vain. Thousands of his men, including nearly all the Poles, were mercilessly butchered with him, by the infuriated people (May 16, 1606). Prince Shuiski was proclaimed czar under the name of Basil III., but being attacked by a new pretender, also calling himself Demetrius, and by the Poles and Swedes, was obliged to resign his throne. The origin and previous history of the new Demetrius are unknown; his abilities were of an inferior kind, but his depredations made him an object of terror, and even the capital was held by him in a kind of blockade for more than a year. Some of his men having captured Maryna, who had been released from prison to return to her country, the ambitious princess acknowledged him as her lawful husband. But the pretender was soon after murdered by a Tartar chief of his guards, and the degraded tzaritzza perished miserably, according to some, in the waters of the Ural, but according to others, in prison. Even after the accession of the house of Romanoff to the throne of Moscow (1613), the convulsions caused

by pretenders, one of whom called himself a son of the first of them, were but slowly suppressed. The history of the first *samozvanietz* has been poetically adorned by Bulharin, Pushkin, and Ohomiakoff, and made the subject of an unfinished drama by Schiller.—Compare P. Mérimée, *Les faux Demetrius* (Paris, 1854).

DEMETRIUS PHALEREUS, so called from being a native of the district of Phalerus, an Athenian orator and statesman, born about 345, died about 282 B. C. The son of poor parents, he studied oratory, poetry, philosophy, and statesmanship, particularly under the guidance of the philosopher Theophrastus, and began his political career in 325, as an eloquent champion of the democratic or anti-Macedonian party. This party being expelled from power, he retired into voluntary exile, but was afterward reconciled with his former opponents; and when, in 317, Cassander of Macedon became virtually master of Athens, he became governor in his behalf, being supported by a Macedonian garrison. He thus ruled Athens for 10 years with moderation and success, though not without perverting the rich revenues of the state to his personal luxury and dissipation. The degenerate Athenians rewarded his services by erecting in his honor as many statues as their year contained days, but these were scornfully broken when Demetrius Poliorcetes surprised the city, in 307, and compelled Phalereus to retire. Condemned to death in his absence, he went to Thebes, and afterward to Egypt, where he was well treated by Ptolemy, son of Lagus, but banished to the upper part of the country by his son Philadelphus, who had been made heir against his advice. He is said to have died of the bite of a snake. The foundation of the Alexandrian library has been attributed by some writers, but with little reason, to his influence with the 1st Ptolemy. In Egypt Demetrius composed numerous historical, philosophical, and literary works, of which only a few fragments are extant, the work on elocution which is known under his name being the production of an Alexandrian sophist. He is one of the last Athenian orators who deserved the name; his eloquence, however, was distinguished by grace and refinement rather than by power.

DEMETRIUS POLIORCETES (the city-besieger), one of the most conspicuous personages in the history of the long and bloody contentions which followed the death of Alexander the Great, born shortly before the accession of that conqueror to the throne of Macedon, was the son of Antigonus, who, in the first division of the Macedonian empire, received several provinces of Asia Minor for his share. In the wars of his father against Eumenes and Ptolemy, Demetrius early evinced valor and devotion to his father's cause. Commanding in Syria, he was defeated by Ptolemy in the battle of Gaza (312 B. C.), but soon restored the balance of the war by a victory over one of his generals, on which occasion he dismissed without ransom several thousands of his captives, thus repaying a simi-

lar magnanimous act of his enemy. A treaty of peace was concluded soon after, but this was of short duration, and the war was continued with various success. More decisive were his services to his father in the expedition to Greece, the most important places of which had been occupied and garrisoned by Cassander, son of Antipater of Macedon. Sailing from Ephesus (307) to Athens, Demetrius entered the harbor of the Piræus with his fleet, which was mistaken for that of Egypt, without meeting with any resistance. Demetrius Phalereus, who had ruled Athens for 10 years, in allegiance to Macedon, was compelled to retire to Thebes; Munychia and Megara, which were defended by garrisons in the interest of Cassander, were unable to withstand the skill and engines of the besieger, and he finally made his triumphant entry into Athens. Having announced the restoration of the ancient democratic institutions, and promised distributions of corn and ship timber, he was received with the most abject flatteries as god and deliverer (*σωτηρ*) by the degenerate people, who now broke the 360 statues recently erected in honor of Demetrius Phalereus. Summoned to the assistance of his father in his war against Ptolemy, he crossed over to Cyprus, defeated the Egyptian fleet, and made himself master of that island, having taken Salamis, its chief city; after which both his father and himself assumed the title of king, and their example was followed by the rival potentates of Egypt, Thrace, and Syria—Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Seleucus. Demetrius next undertook an invasion of Egypt by sea and land, which failed, his forces being repulsed with great loss. He now turned toward Rhodes, which he besieged for more than a year; but the Rhodians, supplied and reinforced by the allied enemies of his father, withstood bravely, and the siege was terminated by a treaty. Poliorcetes then sailed to Greece, which was again threatened with the sway of Cassander. He compelled the Bœotians to relinquish their alliance with Macedon, expelled Cassander from Attica, and made himself master of Corinth, Argos, Sicyon, and most of the towns of Arcadia. In Athens the deified deliverer was received with the wonted honors, and resided as the guest of Minerva in the Parthenon, which he polluted by shameless debauchery. His pleasures and the equally degrading manifestations in his honor were again interrupted by the call of his father, which he was always ready to obey. He hastened to Asia, and fought in the great battle of Ipsus, in Phrygia. The rival forces were nearly equal; but Demetrius, with imprudent valor, pushed too far the victorious advance of his wing; the centre, commanded by his father, was broken, and the old man was slain while yet expecting relief from his son. His dominions were broken up, the greater part falling into the hands of Seleucus. Demetrius, retiring with the remnant of his army, embarked at Ephesus for Athens, but met on his voyage with envoys from that city, who announced to him that he would

not be admitted. This defection was followed by the loss of his other possessions in Greece, his garrisons being expelled from every town. He succeeded, however, in restoring his fortunes by an alliance with Seleucus, to whom he gave his daughter Stratonice in marriage. The treaty of alliance stipulated that Demetrius should retain possession of Cilicia, Cyprus, and a part of the coast of Syria. He now armed for the reconquest of Greece, besieged and after a long resistance took Athens (295), and made a successful expedition into the Peloponnesus, when his attention was turned to Macedon. Cassander and his eldest son Philip had died; the two remaining sons, Antipater and Alexander, were engaged in a bloody struggle for the throne, and the latter invoked the aid both of Demetrius and Pyrrhus of Epirus. Pyrrhus appeared first and vanquished Antipater; Demetrius came after him, and deprived Alexander, who is said to have attempted his assassination, both of his throne and life (294). While he was thus successful in Europe, he lost his possessions in Asia, which were taken by Ptolemy and Seleucus. The following 4 years were occupied by two sieges of Thebes, an invasion of Thrace, and a war with Pyrrhus and the Ætolians, after the termination of which he was preparing for a new campaign in Asia, when he was attacked (287) by a triple invasion from Thrace, Epirus, and Egypt. While marching against the Epirotes he was deserted by his Macedonian troops, who proclaimed Pyrrhus as their king. Demetrius escaped to his son Antigonus Gonatas, who had maintained possession of Greece, and succeeded in saving a part of his dominion by a treaty with Pyrrhus. Leaving his son in Greece, he crossed over to Miletus, and fought his way as far as the northern mountain range of Syria, but was finally compelled to surrender to Seleucus, who kept his father-in-law in confinement at Apamea in Syria till his death in 283. Antigonus, who had lost almost all Greece, offered in vain the remainder of his possessions and himself for the freedom of his father, who in turn ceded to him all his claims, spending his last days in effeminate amusements unworthy of his warlike career.

DEMETRIUS (I.) SOTER (the deliverer), king of Syria, born about 187, died 150 B. C. He was the son of Seleucus Philopator, and grandson of Antiochus the Great. Sent as hostage to Rome by his father, he remained there during the whole reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, after whose death, in 164, he besought the senate to release him and acknowledge him as king of Syria. This being refused, he followed the advice of his friend, the historian Polybius, and escaped secretly from Rome. He landed at Tripolis, in Phœnicia, and was hailed as king by the Syrians; the young Antiochus V. and his tutor Lysias were put to death (162); and rich presents and ready subservience procured the acknowledgment of the new reign by the Romans. Delivering Babylon from the tyranny of a despotic governor, he received his surname

of Soter, from the gratitude of that city. In his war against the revolted Jews his lieutenant Nicanor was routed by Judas Maccabæus, who also concluded a treaty of alliance with the Romans against Demetrius. His interference in the affairs of Cappadocia still more alienated from him the senate of the republic, and his oppressive rule and debauchery disgusted his own people. Instigated by the deposed governor of Babylon, one Balas rose against him, claiming to be Alexander, son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and meeting with assistance from the Romans, Jews, and Cappadocians, finally vanquished him in a battle. Demetrius was slain in his flight, after having performed prodigies of valor. Both Demetrius Nicator and Antiochus Sidetes, his sons, reigned successively after him.

DEMIDOFF, a noble and wealthy Russian family, the most distinguished members of which are the following: I. НИКИТА, with whom the name and nobility of the house originated, born after the middle of the 17th century, the son of a serf in the government of Toola, became a blacksmith and a manufacturer of arms, and having acquired great skill in the working of metals, established for the government the first iron foundery in Siberia at Neviansk, near Ekaterinburg (1699). This served as a model of many other flourishing establishments in the Ural mountains, and was presented to him with its dependencies by Peter the Great, who also ennobled him. II. АКИФИ, son of the preceding, discovered important mines of gold, silver, and copper in different regions of Siberia, which he and his son Nikita were allowed by the government to work for their own profit by German miners. He founded the extensive iron foundries of Lower Tagielsk, was made councillor of state, and died about 1740. III. ПАУЛ, nephew of the preceding, born at Revel in 1738, died in 1826. He travelled through several countries, studied metallurgy at Freiberg in Saxony, and natural science under Linnæus at Upsal, founded at Moscow a public cabinet of natural history, a botanical garden, and a professorship of natural science, and a flourishing lyceum at Yaroslav. IV. НИКОЛАИ, nephew of the preceding, born in 1774, served in two campaigns against the Turks, travelled through Germany, Italy, France, and England, equipped at his own expense and commanded a regiment during the invasion of Napolcon, was made colonel, count, and privy councillor, and died in 1828. He enlarged the wealth of his family by mining enterprises, and added to the collections of the Moscow university a new cabinet of natural history. He is also remarkable as an author on political economy in French. V. АНАТОЛ, son of the preceding, born in Florence in 1812, was educated in France, travelled through southern Russia and adjoining countries, was made prince of San Donato by the grand duke of Tuscany, and married the princess Mathilde de Montfort, daughter of Jerome Bonaparte and Catharine of Würtemberg. But having obliged himself

no pledges could secure peace. In 1533 the duke of Milan put to death an agent of the king of France, charged with murder. Seizing this as a pretext for war, Francis took up arms again, and in 1535 overran Savoy. Charles in the spring of 1536 marched upon Provence, and the French troops hurried again to the defence of that region. Charles lost half his army through famine and disease, the country having been laid waste purposely by the French commander, and with the remainder fled before the light troops of the province. At the same time the prince of Nassau, who had invaded the north of France, was compelled to retreat. Soon after these events, the eldest son of Francis died, poisoned. The crime was laid to the charge of the emperor, probably without any foundation; but the circumstance carried the exasperation of the two sovereigns to the extreme of decency. Francis attacked the Low Countries, and even formed an offensive alliance with the Turkish sultan Solyman; but the pope and the queen of Hungary interposing with offers of mediation, a truce of 10 years was concluded at Nice (1538). The rivals exchanged visits and embraced; and on the occasion of a second visit Charles promised to invest a son of the French king with the sovereignty of Milan, but the promise was never fulfilled, Charles giving the duchy instead to his son Philip. War again broke out in 1542, and Francis sent 5 armies against various quarters of the imperial dominions, and gained a great battle at Cerisolles (1544), but without important consequences. After a short and bootless invasion of France by Henry VIII. and Charles in alliance, peace was again concluded; and no further military events took place during the reign. The king's health had been hopelessly ruined some years before in consequence of one of his many amours, and death at length ensued. Francis was an unhesitating libertine, though during the latter years of his life his attention was given to wiser thoughts; and notwithstanding his vices and his cruelty to the Protestants, admiration cannot be withheld from many gallant and noble traits of character, which might have been blessings to his country had he been content with any other than military glory. He introduced into France striking improvements of art and learning. He was gifted with remarkable elegance and grace. In youth he was the *magnus Apollo* of his comrades, "the courtier's, scholar's, soldier's eye, tongue, sword." Of his munificence many monuments remain; as the imperial library of Paris, the imperial college, the original Louvre, Fontainebleau, and Chambord. By his first wife he had 7 children; by the second none. To his son Henry II. he bequeathed a treasury with a surplus of 400,000 crowns.

FRANCIS II., king of France, born in Fontainebleau, Jan. 19, 1543, died in Orleans, Dec. 5, 1560. He was the eldest son of Henry II. and Catharine de' Medici. His father, more brave than wise, more devoted to amours and chival-

ric amusements than to the management of affairs of state, had yet succeeded in obtaining some important advantages over the emperor Charles V. and the house of Spain, and in terminating favorably a long series of wars, chiefly in Italy and the Netherlands, against the growing might of that house. Henry died in 1559 of a wound accidentally received in a tournament. Francis, then a boy of 16 years, possessed of neither character, strength, nor talent, succeeded to the throne. He had already married the daughter of James V. of Scotland, the beautiful and afterward unhappy Mary Stuart. Her influence gave the reins of government to her uncles, Francis duke of Guise, and the cardinal of Lorraine. The arrogant sway of these two ambitious and unscrupulous princes alarmed and irritated the princes of the blood, Anthony king of Navarre, and his brother Louis of Condé, who became the leaders of a Protestant party in opposition to the court. Every thing concurred to produce civil commotion. Protestantism had penetrated, in the form of Calvinism, into France. Its spirit suited that of the feudal nobility, and the profligacy and corruption introduced by the Italian Medicis into the court and manners of France, and the influence of strangers, disposed the people to rebellion. It was by secret plots, however, rather than by open revolt, that the Protestant princes tried to wrest power from the hands of the Guises. Assisted by the duke of Montmorency, La Renaudie, and others, they framed the conspiracy of Amboise, in which they agreed to enter that place on a certain day in detached parties, to massacre the Guises, and seize the person of the king. But the plot was denounced almost at the moment of execution, by two Protestants; the duke of Guise secretly assembled a body of troops, and cut to pieces the forces of the conspirators as they were entering the city. His triumph was stained with barbarous cruelty, and the waters of the Loire were colored with the blood of those who fell in combat or perished on the scaffold. The court was depraved or bigoted enough to gaze at the executions, as scenes of public festivity, from platforms and the windows of the castle. Arrests and executions throughout the country followed. The duke of Guise was made lieutenant-general of the kingdom. The axe was brought into play to stifle the opposition of the princes, and the inquisition was set up to repress Calvinism. A royal edict made the bishops, instead of the parliaments, judges of heresy; the chancellor De l'Hôpital gave his consent, led by reasons of humanity and caution, and having sufficient proof of the persecuting spirit of the parliaments. But at the same time, and for the same reasons, he urged the calling of a general, or, if the pope refused, of a national council, to pacify the church and France. The princes of Lorraine, desirous of completing their victory by the death of Condé, convened the states-general at Orleans. Condé had tried to dissemble his mortification after the failure of Amboise, and was now impru-

dent enough to appear. He was arrested, tried, and soon condemned to die as a traitor. The death of Francis, however, saved his life, and restored him to the leadership of the Huguenots. The young king had long suffered from an abscess in his ear, and died after a reign of 17 months, so suddenly that rumors of poison, now regarded as unfounded, spread, and were believed throughout the country; the more easily, as assassination was becoming fashionable in France, and the queen mother was renowned for her love of alchemy and the use of poisons. Francis bequeathed to his brother and successor, Charles IX., then a boy of 10 years of age, a treasury loaded with debt, and a state full of the elements of civil war. The regency was intrusted to Catharine de' Medici, whose intrigues fostered the flame of civil and religious dissensions.

FRANCIS I. (STEPHEN), emperor of Germany, born in 1708, died Aug. 18, 1765. He was the son of Leopold, duke of Lorraine, and of a niece of Louis XIV., and the great-grandson of Ferdinand III., emperor of Germany. In 1729 he succeeded his father as duke of Lorraine and Bar, but in consequence of the war of the Polish succession, in which Louis XV. took a feeble part in support of his father-in-law, Stanislas Leszczynski, the dethroned king of Poland, his duchy was exchanged for Tuscany, where the house of Medici was on the point of becoming extinct, and given to Stanislas, to revert after his death to the crown of France. Francis soon after married Maria Theresa, daughter and heiress of the emperor Charles VI. Charles appointed him generalissimo, and he fought in a successful campaign against the Turks. After the death of the last of the Medicis, he went with Maria to Florence, the capital of his new dominion, and returned with her after the death of Charles, to share with her the regency, the cares, but not the prerogatives of the inherited crowns. He fought for her rights in the wars which now ensued in spite of the pragmatic sanction, and which would have deprived her of her inheritance had she not been stoutly supported by her Hungarians, who swore at Presburg to die for their "king Maria Theresa," and found an ally in George II. of England. Frederic the Great of Prussia was satisfied with the glory won in the wars of Silesia, and the conquest of that province, and Charles of Bavaria, who had been chosen emperor, died in 1745. Francis could now be elected, and was acknowledged in the peace of Aix la Chapelle as emperor of Germany (1748). Being of a mild and peaceful disposition, and influenced more by personal avarice than by ambition, he promoted commerce and agriculture, particularly in Tuscany, but left the heavier cares of government to his masculine consort, who was soon again involved in a 7 years' war with Frederic. Two years after the termination of this war Francis died at Innsbruck, leaving the German crown to his son Joseph II., for whom his mother reigned till 1780, and Tuscany to his younger son, afterward Leopold II.

FRANCIS II., emperor of Germany (I. of Austria), born in Florence, Feb. 6, 1768, died in Vienna, March 2, 1835. He was the son of the emperor Leopold II. and of Maria Louisa, daughter of Charles III., king of Spain. He was educated first at the polished and popular court of Florence, then at that of Vienna, where he had an opportunity of studying the statesmanship and reign of his uncle, Joseph II. He accompanied him in his unsuccessful campaign against the Turks, and even took the title of commander-in-chief of the army, though still a youth of 21 years, while the old and experienced general Laudon served as an assistant. After the death of Joseph (1790), Francis held the reins of the empire for a few days, till the arrival of his father from Florence, whom he followed in the next year to the convention of Pilnitz, where the emperor and the king of Prussia formed the first coalition against revolutionary France. The short and mild reign of Leopold ended in 1792, and Francis succeeded him in his hereditary dominions, and was successively crowned king of Hungary, emperor of Germany, and king of Bohemia, but was soon surrounded with difficulties and dangers. Hungary, stripped of its constitutional privileges by the centralizing and Germanizing efforts of Joseph, and not fully appeased by the concessions of Leopold, was in a state of national excitement, and the Belgian provinces were ripe for revolt. The legislative assembly of France obliged Louis XVI. to declare war against the young king of Hungary and Bohemia in April, 1792. The victories of Dumouriez and the revolt of Belgium, the victories of Custine on the Rhine, the execution of Louis XVI., and that of the queen Marie Antoinette, the aunt of Francis, followed in rapid train. It was in vain that Clairfait obtained some advantages over the French, that Francis took the command in person, and was for a time successful, that a new and mightier coalition was formed; the armies of the republic soon drove back the allies; Francis's confederates deserted him, and in 1795 Tuscany, Sweden, Spain, and even the king of Prussia, concluded at Basel a treaty of peace with the republic, whose Italian army, now commanded by Gen. Bonaparte, conquered in the two next years the whole north of Italy. Francis himself, notwithstanding some slight advantages gained by his brother the archduke Charles over Moreau, in southern Germany, was finally forced to conclude the treaty of Campo Formio (Oct. 17, 1797), in which he sacrificed Belgium, Milan, and a Rhenish province of the empire, in exchange for Venice. Changes in France and new French aggressions tempted Austria, Russia, and England to another war. The allied armies were successful for a while under the archduke Charles in Germany, under Hotze in Switzerland, and under Kray and Suwaroff in Italy. But reverses came; Suwaroff was recalled by his emperor, and Bonaparte, returning from Egypt, became master of France by a *coup d'état*, and of Italy by the passage of

the Alps and the battle of Marengo (June 14, 1800), while Moreau fought his way through southern Germany toward Vienna. These disasters compelled Francis to the peace of Lunéville, by which he lost a portion of Germany and acquired a portion of Italy. England made peace with France at Amiens, but broke it again, and framed a new coalition, in which the emperors Francis and Alexander and the king of Sweden took part, while Prussia remained neutral, and Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden were ready to side with the French. Francis expected the first attack from Italy, and sent thither his brother Charles, who gained a battle over Masséna; but Napoleon broke through Germany, and his sudden marches, the surrender of Ulm with its 24,000 men under Mack, the retreat of the archduke Ferdinand, and the great battle of Austerlitz (Dec. 2, 1805), in which the two allied emperors were present, made him the dictator of the treaty concluded at Presburg, in which Francis lost the Tyrol, Venice, and 3,000,000 subjects, and received only Salzburg. The electors of Bavaria and Würtemberg now took the title of kings as a reward for their support of the victor; the confederation of the Rhine was founded under Napoleon's protectorate, and the French ambassadors declared that they no longer recognized a German empire or a German constitution. Francis, who had already assumed the title of hereditary emperor of Austria, solemnly laid down that of emperor of Germany in Aug. 1806. But Napoleon, having crushed Prussia, Portugal, and Italy, threatened Austria again. Francis armed the ancient German militia, and resorted to the general rising of the Hungarian nobles. Three brothers of the emperor were sent with armies across the German, Italian, and Polish frontiers; but Austria stood this time alone, while Napoleon was assisted by Poles, Russians, and Germans. With the exception of the battle of Aspern and Essling, May 21 and 22, 1809, in which Napoleon suffered his first defeat, the whole campaign in Germany was a series of French victories. The Austrians were forced to evacuate Vienna, driven from Poland, and signally defeated at Wagram; the Hungarian nobles were dispersed, and a rising of the Tyrolese in favor of Austria proved abortive. The peace of Schönbrunn cost Francis some rich provinces, and more than 3,500,000 subjects. The resources of his empire were exhausted, and his treasury had long been bankrupt. In this situation he consented to give his daughter Maria Louisa in marriage to Napoleon, and soon saw the title of king of Rome, once his own, bestowed upon her child. But the power as well as the presumption of Napoleon had now attained its highest pitch. In the disastrous Russian campaign of 1812 an auxiliary Austrian force occupied Poland in the French interest, but effected little. In 1813 Francis declared his neutrality, and on Napoleon's refusal to accept his mediation with Russia he joined the allies, and contributed largely to their victory at Leipsic. In the following year

he entered France with his army, and remained two months in Paris after its occupation by the allies, March 31. In June the European congress assembled at Vienna, but the brilliant festivals with which Francis entertained his guests were interrupted in March, 1815, by the news of Napoleon's return from Elba. An Austrian army now crossed the Simplon and occupied Lyons, while another marched into Italy, overthrew Murat, and restored to the old king Ferdinand the crown of Naples. On the restoration of peace after the battle of Waterloo, Francis, having ceded Belgium to the Netherlands, and acquired Lombardy and Venice, saw his empire greater than it had ever been before. His policy, developed by Metternich, became the policy of Europe. Based on a horror of revolution, and a reverence for hereditary right, it took the form of a thorough conservatism and centralization, supported by a large standing army, a secret police, strict subordination, a literary censorship, and all the measures of repression familiar to an arbitrary government. Austria was the centre of all the reactionary movements of the period following the French restoration. Monarchical congresses for the suppression of the revolutionary spirit of Germany, Spain, and Italy were held on its territory at Carlsbad in 1819, at Troppau in 1820, at Laybach in 1821, and at Verona in 1822; Austrian armies restored order in Piedmont and Naples, and Austrian influence prevailed in Spain, Portugal, and the German confederacy at Frankfurt. Francis sanctioned even the despotic rule of Turkey over Greece, and imprisoned the Greek refugee Ypselantes. He was the first to counteract in Italy the influence of the French revolution of July, 1830, and was of aid to Czar Nicholas in the Polish war of independence in 1831. It was nevertheless a constant though secret part of his policy to check the growing and threatening power of Russia. At home his chief embarrassments sprang from an exhausted treasury, enormous debts, and the uneasiness of the Italians, Hungarians, and Slavi. New loans and taxes relieved his finances; state prisons and rigorous punishments were used to crush the spirit of independence in Italy; while the diet of Presburg was appeased by reluctant concessions, and German officials kept order in Poland and Bohemia. In the promotion of industry, commerce, and the arts in the German provinces, and the advancement of German influence, he showed a wiser policy. The courts of law were reorganized, and the ancient codes were revised and modified. Francis was economical, industrious, and regular in his personal habits, popular with the Germans, but little known and less liked by his other subjects. The antipathies inspired by the reactionary measures of his government, and the attacks of the liberal press in foreign countries (for there was none in Austria), and of the Hungarian patriots in their diets and county assemblies, were directed less against the emperor than against his minister Metternich. His private treasury was in an incomparably better condi-

tion than that of the state, and his family was large and prosperous. The latter part of his reign was undisturbed. Of his 4 wives, princesses of Würtemberg, Sicily, Modena, and Bavaria, the second, Maria Theresa, was the mother of 13 children, among whom were Maria Louisa, wife of Napoleon I., Ferdinand, who succeeded to the throne, and Francis Charles, the father of the present emperor, Francis Joseph I.

FRANCIS JOSEPH, the reigning emperor of Austria, grandson of the preceding, eldest son of the archduke Francis Charles, and nephew of Ferdinand I., born Aug. 18, 1830. He was educated under the care of Count Bombelles, and was early inspired with ambition by his mother, the archduchess Sophia, daughter of the king of Bavaria and sister of the queens of Prussia and Saxony, a handsome, energetic, and unscrupulous woman, who possessed more influence and enterprising spirit than either the emperor himself or her husband, the heir presumptive to the throne. Like his uncle Ferdinand, he was taught to speak the various languages of his polyglot empire, and also became a skilful rider and fond of military displays, without however evincing any particular talent. Sent to Pesth in 1847 to install his cousin Stephen as palatine of Hungary, he spoke Hungarian to the assembled nobles, and even gained some popularity. This, however, was of short duration. The revolutions of 1848 having brought the Austrian empire to the brink of dissolution, his mother became the leading spirit in the counter-revolutionary plots which saved it. Francis Joseph was sent to the army of Italy, and was favorably mentioned in some reports of Gen. Radetzky. Lombardy having been reconquered by that general, Prague and Vienna subdued by Windischgrätz, and the Hungarians defeated before Vienna, it seemed to the archduchess Sophia that the moment had arrived for completing her work. Francis Joseph was declared of age, Dec. 1, 1848, at the temporary court of Olmütz, and on the following day his father resigned his right to the succession, and the emperor his crown, in favor of the youthful prince. Hungary had still to be conquered, and a constituent Austrian parliament was assembled at Kremsir. The young emperor in his inaugural proclamation promised a constitutional, progressive, and liberal reign. Its beginning was successful. The Hungarians under Görgey retreated before Windischgrätz, giving up Presburg, Raab, and finally (Jan. 5, 1849) Buda and Pesth; Guyon and Perczel were routed; Schlick was victorious in the north of Hungary. The battle of Kápolna (Feb. 26, 27), which was announced by Prince Windischgrätz as a decisive victory over the united main army of the rebels, was believed to have given the finishing blow to the revolution in Hungary. On receiving this news the emperor dissolved the Austrian parliament, ordered the arrest of its liberal members, and promulgated a new constitution of his own (*octroyirte Verfassung*), known as the

constitution of March 4. But on the very next morning the victory of Danubius at Szolnok destroyed at once the delusions of Windischgrätz, and now the imperial army suffered defeat after defeat in Hungary and Transylvania. Radetzky, however, was again victorious over Charles Albert in Italy (March 23). To subdue Hungary foreign aid was necessary. Francis Joseph, therefore, went to Warsaw to invoke the assistance of the czar Nicholas. This was granted, and Hungary was soon invaded from every quarter. Francis Joseph himself went for some time to that country, and was present at the taking of Raab (June 28). After the fall of the revolution, its leaders who had surrendered were punished with unmitigated severity. One day (Oct. 6) witnessed the execution of Count Batthyanyi, the Hungarian Egmont, at Pesth, and of 13 generals at Arad, all of whom had voluntarily surrendered. The dungeons of the empire were filled with victims. Görgey alone was spared. Soon after the surrender of Venice (Aug. 23) and Comorn, which inaugurated the unlimited centralizing sway of the minister of the interior, Bach, Prince Felix Schwarzenberg resumed with new energy the management of foreign affairs. The revolutionary schemes of a German union apart from Austria had been defeated; now the schemes of Prussia for forming a separate union with a number of smaller German states were discomfited. In Oct. 1850, Francis Joseph mustered his south German allies at Bregenz, and in Nov. Prussia yielded to their threatening attitude. Austrian influence prevailed in restoring the ancient order in the electorate of Hesse and in Schleswig-Holstein, as well as the ancient federal diet at Frankfurt. After the death of Schwarzenberg, who was succeeded by Count Buol-Schauenstein as minister of foreign affairs, Francis Joseph renewed his friendly relations with Frederic William IV. in an interview at Berlin (Dec. 1852), which was followed by a treaty of commerce (Feb. 1853). In the meanwhile absolutism was gradually reestablished within the empire. The national guards were dissolved, the freedom of the press put down, and finally the constitution itself, which had never been in operation, abolished (Jan. 1, 1852). The unfavorable reception which the emperor met with in Hungary on a journey undertaken in the autumn of the same year proved that that country felt, as it was treated, as a conquered province. An outbreak at Milan (Feb. 6, 1853), which was suppressed by Radetzky, evinced the revolutionary spirit of Lombardy. On Feb. 18 of the same year, while walking on the public promenade of Vienna, the emperor was furiously attacked with a knife by a young Hungarian tailor, named Libényi, who had for months meditated and coolly prepared for this deed. The wound inflicted was regarded as threatening to the life, and afterward to the sight, of the monarch, who, however, slowly recovered. Libényi, who had been disarmed with difficulty, died on the gallows

protesting his fidelity to republicanism and Hungary. A few months afterward Czar Nicholas paid Francis Joseph a visit at Olmütz, but the attitude of the latter in the war in Turkey, which soon followed, and during which he concluded a treaty with the allies (Dec. 2, 1854), occupied the Danubian principalities, and concentrated a large army in Galicia, was far from satisfying either Russia or her enemies. The treaty of Paris (1856), which terminated the great struggle, was signed on the part of Austria by Buol and Hübner. The expenses of all these diplomatic and military undertakings were met by means of extravagant and often violent financial operations. In April, 1854, Francis Joseph married Elizabeth, daughter of the Bavarian duke Maximilian Joseph of Zweibrücken-Birkenfeld, who in 1855 bore him a daughter, Sophia, in 1856 another, Gisela, and in 1858 a son, Rudolph. All these family events were followed by partial and scanty political amnesties. The first born child died during a second imperial journey through Hungary, in 1857, at Buda. In October of the same year Francis Joseph received a visit at Vienna from Alexander II. of Russia, which quieted the apprehensions caused by a preceding interview of the same monarch with Napoleon III. at Stuttgart. While Austrian diplomacy was thus successful in its various operations, it was most effectually active in Italy. A concordat concluded with the see of Rome (1855), which conferred extraordinary rights upon the Roman Catholic bishops and the Jesuits, and private treaties with Tuscany, Parma, and Modena, made Austrian influence predominant in the peninsula. Beyond the Po, Austria held the important military positions of Ancona and Piacenza. To counterbalance this state of things, Sardinia strengthened herself by increasing her army, by enlisting the sympathies as well as the refugees of the other Italian states, and finally by an alliance with Napoleon III. On New Year's day, 1859, the emperor Napoleon declared to the diplomatic corps in Paris his dissatisfaction with the Italian policy of Francis Joseph, and his few words were understood by Austria as a threat, if not as a declaration of war. On both sides the most active preparations for a great struggle began. Napoleon demanded from Austria the surrender of her private treaties with the Italian states, and the evacuation of all non-Austrian territories in Italy; Austria demanded from Sardinia a disarmament and the expulsion of the refugees. None of these demands was agreed to. The alarmed English ministry in vain offered its mediation. The proposition to call a European congress, made by Russia, was agreed to by Napoleon, but rejected by Francis Joseph, who objected to the admission of Sardinia in the congress. Austrian reënforcements were pouring into Lombardy; French troops began to cross the Alps, and to sail from Marseilles for Genoa. At this juncture Francis Joseph surprised the world by sending an ultimatum to

Sardinia, April 19, granting but 3 days for a compliance with his conditions, and by the commencement of hostilities immediately following its rejection. The Austrians, under Count Gyulai, crossed the Ticino (April 26, 27), and occupied the N. E. provinces of Piedmont as far as the Dora Baltea, while their left wing was advanced as far as Bobbio on the Trebbia. They thus threatened both Turin and Genoa; but every thing soon took an unfavorable turn for them. On the very first day of the war a bloodless revolution broke out at Florence, in consequence of which the grand duke left Tuscany, and the country was placed under the military dictatorship of Victor Emanuel, the king of Sardinia. Similar movements soon after drove the duke of Modena and the duchess of Parma into exile. The overflowing tributaries of the Po, and probably want of decision, prevented a bold stroke against the Sardinians before the approach of the French and the arrival of their emperor. After the first vigorous repulse suffered from the French at Montebello (May 20), the Austrians gave up the offensive, retiring toward the Ticino and Piacenza. The allied armies closely followed, commanded by the respective monarchs in person. Victor Emanuel, on the left, crossed the Sesia, and won the battle of Palestro (May 31); Garibaldi at the head of a troop of volunteers was allowed to enter Lombardy, and to rouse the mountaineers of the lake region; while, masked by a false display on the right, Napoleon transferred the main bulk of his army behind the line of the Sardinians to the banks of the Ticino, which he crossed at Turbigo and Buffalora (June 3), before the Austrian commanders perceived their mistake. Recrossing the Ticino in haste, but too late, they threw themselves unsuccessfully upon Buffalora, and suffered the first great defeat at Magenta (June 4). Francis Joseph, arriving from Vienna, reached his army after the evacuation of Milan (June 5). A general retreat was now begun, interrupted only by the battle and defeat at Melegnano (June 8). Piacenza and Pizzighetone with their fortifications, the lines of the Oglio and Chiese, as well as Ancona and Bologna, were given up without a blow. Lombardy, Parma, and Modena proclaimed their annexation to Piedmont. Arrived on the banks of the Mincio, the retreating army once more turned against the closely following enemy, and Francis Joseph, having dismissed Gen. Gyulai, held the chief command in person in the great battle of Solferino (June 24), in which nearly half a million of combatants were engaged for a whole day, on a line extending from the lake of Garda to the vicinity of the Po. The victory of the allies was, as in every preceding battle, dearly purchased, but it conquered the line of the Mincio. Francis Joseph retired to Verona, followed by his army, and soon after by that of the allies. The armies were in sight of each other; the French fleet was threatening Zara, Fiume, and Venice, Kosuth preparing to revolutionize Hungary, Prus-

struggle. He enjoyed little freedom in the second and peaceful half of Frederic's reign, was obliged to repudiate his first wife, Elizabeth of Brunswick, because of ill conduct, and lived in a circle of his own, in which some visionaries of the then powerfully organized sect of illuminati were particularly conspicuous, who maintained their influence over him even after his accession to the throne. This took place on Aug. 17, 1786. Freed from his long continued restraint, the new king gave himself up without moderation to his voluptuous inclinations. Mistresses and favorites reigned in the court and squandered the treasures of the state. The favor of the people he sought to gain by ostentatious mildness; even the discipline of the army, so renowned under Frederic, was relaxed. The first important act of his policy abroad, which was but slightly influenced by the energetic minister Herzberg, was to reinstate in power his brother-in-law the stadtholder of the Netherlands, who had been deposed by the anti-Orange party. A Prussian army under the duke of Brunswick entered Holland, occupied Amsterdam, and restored the ancient order of things, which was confirmed by a treaty concluded in 1788, at the Hague, by Prussia, England, and Holland. Alarmed by the alliance of the emperor Joseph II. with Catharine II. of Russia, and by the successes of the Russians in the war against Turkey, he concluded a treaty with the latter power guaranteeing all its possessions. An army was assembled in Silesia, near the Bohemian frontier. Before the outbreak of the war, however, Frederic William wavered, and finally restored his good understanding with Austria by the treaty of Reichenbach (1790), concluded with the successor of Joseph, Leopold II., who soon also made peace with the Porte. Russia, however, was allowed to continue her operations undisturbed, and the encouraging promises made to the Belgian patriots were soon forgotten. Herzberg resigned. The interview at Pilnitz with the emperor (1791) prepared the first coalition against the French revolution. The hostile operations began in the spring of 1792. The duke of Brunswick entered France in June; the king and the crown prince, the son of his second wife, Louisa of Hesse-Darmstadt, joined him soon after. Want of harmony and repeated blunders on the part of the allies, revolutionary fanaticism and the skill of the commanders on the side of the French, soon turned the scale in favor of the latter, compelling Frederic William to keep the defensive, and finally to conclude the treaty of Basel (1795) with the republic, in which he ceded his territories beyond the Rhine, contracting for future indemnities and a kind of protectorate over northern Germany. His participation in the affairs of Poland, fickle and treacherous as his policy was, was productive of more advantageous results. Having encouraged the so-called Long Polish diet in its efforts to regenerate the state and to make it independent of Russia, by a treaty in which he guaranteed its integrity (1790), he afterward,

when engaged in the war with France, found it more convenient and more profitable to share the prey with Russia and Austria. He marched his army into Poland, and actively promoted the second and third dismemberment of the unhappy republic (1793-'95). His share was large, extending to the Niemen, and including the capital, Warsaw. These wars and the extravagance of the court exhausted the finances of Prussia. Intolerant edicts and severe restrictions of the press contributed to make his reign unpopular. It must, however, be acknowledged that it was not without merit in developing the resources of the state and the welfare of the people by useful internal improvements. The juridical organization of Prussia was also greatly promoted under Frederic William.

FREDERIC WILLIAM III., son and successor of the preceding, born Aug. 3, 1770, died June 7, 1840. Educated with care by his virtuous mother, Louisa of Hesse-Darmstadt, he had ample opportunity of comparing, at the courts of Frederic the Great and of his father, the opposite influence of royal virtues and vices upon the affairs of his state; and he early contracted the love of order, discipline, economy, and labor, which in after time contributed no little to the prosperity of his people. He accompanied his father to the conference of Pilnitz, and to the army of the first coalition against France, and in 1793 married the beautiful and accomplished princess Louisa of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, after his accession to the throne (1797) the most popular queen of Prussia. The great task of the new reign was to purge the court and the administration of the creatures and abuses of the preceding. This was done with energy. The unpopular edicts restricting the press and the freedom of religious instruction were abrogated, and economy and order restored in the administration. In his foreign policy the young king maintained the neutrality imposed by the treaty of Basel, the temporary stipulations of which were made definite by the treaty of Luneville (1801). For its cessions on the left bank of the Rhine, Prussia soon after received ample compensations in small territories deprived of their independence as members of the empire by decree of the Germanic diet. Satisfied with his acquisitions and political influence in the north of Germany, Frederic William refused to join the third coalition against France which was formed by England, Russia, and Austria. But when the French armies had infringed the neutrality of the Prussian territories, Frederic William secretly allied himself with Alexander of Russia, during a sudden visit of the latter at Berlin. Hesitation, however, spoiled the effect of this alliance, and the battle of Austerlitz was followed by a new treaty with Napoleon (Dec. 1805). Ceding Anspach, Cleves, and Neufchâtel, it received Hanover from the conqueror. The consequence of this exchange was what Napoleon wanted, a declaration of war by England against Prussia. The latter was also embroiled with Sweden. Having made peace

with these enemies, Frederic William made peremptory demands on Napoleon in behalf of the neutrality of his state and its allies in northern Germany. Napoleon answered with prompt hostilities, and the battles of Jena and Auerstädt were both fought on Oct. 14, 1806. The powerful Prussian army was broken, Berlin was occupied by the enemy, and the fortresses surrendered at the first summons. The aid of Alexander was of little avail. After a winter campaign in Prussian Poland and the indecisive battles of Pultusk (Dec. 26) and Eylau (Feb. 8, 1807), Napoleon conquered peace by the battle of Friedland, won on the anniversary of Marengo (June 14). The treaty of Tilsit (July) sacrificed one half of Prussia, parts of which were transformed into the duchy of Warsaw, and others attached to the kingdom of Westphalia. The other half remained for years in the hands of the conqueror, and was treated as a subdued province. The king, who paid a visit with the queen to Alexander, could not return to his capital before 1809. This gloomy period, however, became one of the most successful in the history of the state by a series of salutary and energetic reforms, undertaken and executed particularly under the celebrated ministers Stein and Hardenberg. Serfdom was abolished, the towns obtained some independence in the management of their own affairs through city representatives, the royal domains were sold, convents and ecclesiastical foundations converted into state property, public instruction was organized, and the new university of Berlin founded. The new system of military organization of Prussia had also its origin in that period. In 1810 the king lost his wife, the faithful companion of his misfortunes. In 1812 he was compelled to aid Napoleon with an army against Russia. Forming the left of the great French army of invasion, it was saved on the retreat by a special arrangement between its commander, York, and Diebitsch. York was officially blamed, but soon received a due acknowledgment of his patriotic act. Having transferred his residence to Breslau (Jan. 1813), Frederic William now issued his famous proclamation, which was answered by a general rising of the nation against France. The capital of Prussia alone is said to have contributed a force of 10,000 men. Fortunately, prudent measures had been adopted in secret to prepare for the struggle. The youth, meeting privately, had been drilled in the use of arms in small detachments. Thus the power of the people answered to their will. The militia having been summoned, war against France was declared on March 17. The situation had its dangers. The French still held the fortresses of Prussia and Poland; their army in the dominions of the king still amounted to 60,000. But the hour of success had passed for Napoleon. The continual desertion of his allies served to strengthen the phalanx of the coalition after every defeat of his armies. His enormous new levies were not sufficient to cover the extraor-

dinary losses, and to face so many enemies. The Prussians fought bravely in various engagements in 1813 and 1814 (see BÜCHER), and the king often gave proofs of personal activity and courage. He entered Paris with his allies, accompanied Alexander on his visit to England, made, in Aug. 1814, a triumphal entry into his capital, and repaired to the congress of Vienna. The stipulations of this congress conferred on Prussia greater power than it possessed before the wars, enlarging it particularly with parts of Saxony, one of the last allies of Napoleon. The sudden return of the captive of Elba called the Prussian army again to arms, and Blücher, after his previous defeat, appeared at Waterloo in time to finish the great struggle. The last 25 years of the reign of Frederic William form a period of undisturbed peace and prosperity for Prussia. Closely allied with the czar Alexander, and afterward with Nicholas, the king pursued a policy of strict conservatism. Much was done for internal improvements, little for political reform. Revolutionary agitations, wherever they manifested themselves, were suppressed with severity. Science, however, was patronized, and the king could boast of the friendship of the Humboldts. The last years of his reign were agitated by a strife with the Roman Catholic clergy. The eldest of his 4 sons succeeded him as Frederic William IV. One of his daughters was married to the emperor Nicholas. In 1824 he had formed a morganatic marriage with the countess Augusta of Harrach, whom he made duchess of Liegnitz.

FREDERIC WILLIAM IV., son and successor of the preceding, born Oct. 15, 1795. He received a careful scientific education, though his boyhood was passed in the most disastrous period of Prussian history, and his youth in that of the great struggle against Napoleon. Ancillon, Delbrück, Scharnhorst, Knesbeck, Savigny, Ritter, and Rauch were among his teachers in philosophy, belles-lettres, military science, political economy, and art. He was often present on the scene of action during the last campaign against Napoleon, became familiarly acquainted with many distinguished men of his age, of whom Humboldt remained attached to him through life, and developed his taste for the fine arts while residing in Paris after its occupation by the allies, and on a journey to Italy in 1828. Admitted to the councils of his father, he evinced a marked independence of opinion with much administrative ability. As military governor of Pomerania, his affability gained him general popularity. Great expectations had been formed of his future career when he succeeded to the throne (June 7, 1840). His first solemn declaration at Königsberg, a limited political amnesty, the reinstating of Arndt, the old liberal poet, the reappointment to office of the popular lieutenant-general Von Boyen, the conciliatory termination of a difficulty between the state and the Roman Catholic clergy, were hailed with applause; but the appointment of statesmen like Hassenpflug and Eich-

horn, the patronage bestowed on the nobility, as well as on the representatives of the historical-romantic and pietistic schools, the dismissal of Bruno Bauer from his professorship, the suspension of Braun, the expulsion from the kingdom of Prussian and non-Prussian democrats, among others of Herwegh, Itzstein, and Hecker, the severe application of literary censorship, and the cordial relations of the court with the czar Nicholas, the brother-in-law of the king, soon destroyed the hopes of the liberal part of the nation. An attempt on the life of the king by the dismissed burgomaster Tschsch in 1844 was punished with death. The development given to the representation by provincial estates, which had been introduced under the preceding reign, by the convocation of their standing committees in 1842, and by the convocation of the united provincial estates of the kingdom in Feb. 1847, was made less significant by the distinct declaration of the king that the representatives, far from becoming legislators, would be allowed only to give advice to the unlimited sovereign, and that he would never consent to bind his inherited authority by a written compact. Periodical meetings of the united assembly were asked for in vain. The government, though granting general toleration, declared against the separation of the church from the state, and the emancipation of the Jews, and avowedly sought to rule the kingdom in conformity with the views of the school generally known as pietists. Much more was done for the material interests of the state through internal improvements, commercial union with foreign states, and the commercial union with the north of Germany (*Zollverein*), which also extended the political influence of Prussia. The Polish conspiracy of 1846, which threatened the eastern possessions of the king, was detected in time in the duchy of Posen; the outbreak in the same province was easily suppressed; the insurgents of Cracow, who laid down their arms on Prussian territory, were treated with rigor. The people were already politically agitated by the lively discussions of the diet (from April 11 to June 22, 1847), and of its standing committees, assembled Jan. 18, 1848, and also by the trial of the insurrectionists of Posen, and of Mieroslawski, the destined leader of the Polish movement, as well as by the victory of the liberals in Switzerland over the *Sonderbund*, the constitutional movements in Italy, and the revolution in Sicily, when the news of the French revolution of Feb. 24 involved the whole of Germany in a flame. The popular movement was victorious all over the south-west and south of the confederation, before Frederic William was forced to yield to its irresistible current. Even after the fall of Metternich in Vienna (March 13), he was determined to maintain his royal authority, and to grant liberties only as free gifts. Threatening popular gatherings in Berlin were dispersed by his faithful soldiery before he proclaimed the freedom of the press and the promise of a change in the form of gov-

ernment. These concessions were received with enthusiasm, but the people still demanded the removal of the hated troops from the capital, and for this purpose a deputation of citizens repaired to the palace (March 18), while a crowd of people assembled before it. The deputation was refused admittance, and soldiers advanced from the court of the palace to clear the place. Some shots were fired. Immediately the people dispersed in every direction with cries of "Treason! they are murdering us! revenge!" Hundreds of barricades were erected in a few hours, the arsenal was stormed, and a furious fight ensued, which raged till the morning of the next day, when the king commanded the retreat of the troops and their removal from the city. The corpses of the fallen combatants were carried into the courtyard of the palace, and the king was compelled to appear before them with uncovered head; the palace of his then very unpopular brother, the prince of Prussia, was declared national property. The ministry was dismissed, a civic guard organized, and a general amnesty granted. Mieroslawski, who had been sentenced to death, was carried in triumph through the streets of Berlin, and 250 of his associates left the prison with him, and hastened to Posen to commence the restoration of Poland, the new ministry promising its assistance. The king now openly and ostentatiously declared his purpose to take the lead in Germany; the diet was again assembled (April 2), to elaborate a new election law. It was dissolved after the passage of that law on April 5, and a constituent assembly was convened in Berlin (May 22), while the delegates of Prussia also appeared in the national German parliament which in Frankfort-on-the-Main had superseded the diet of the princes (*Bundestag*). Prussian troops were sent to Schleswig-Holstein to assist the German inhabitants in their revolt against the king of Denmark. In Posen, however, where the Poles had risen in a bloody insurrection, the troops restored order after furious contests with the half-armed bands under Mieroslawski (April and May). This was the first reactionary victory. Others followed. While the revolution was losing its time in endless speech-making, framing of constitutions, and scheming on the reorganization of Germany as a united empire, in the assemblies of Frankfort, Berlin, Vienna, and elsewhere; while it was wasting its power in party strifes and useless undertakings, and degenerating through the excesses of the populace, the governments, which had maintained their armies, paved the way for a complete restoration of their power by mutual understanding, skilful counter-revolutionary manœuvres, continually changing ministries, and varying programmes. In Prussia the men who, by their zeal, activity, or popularity, best assisted the government during the dangerous period of the revolution, were the ministers Camphausen, Pful, Radowitz, Brandenburg, and Manteuffel, and the generals Willisen and Wrangel. Emboldened by the tried fidelity of

the army and the growing desire for order among the wealthier classes, by the reaction in France, and the successes of the Austrian government in Prague, Lombardy, and Vienna, Frederic William prorogued the Prussian constituent assembly, transferring it to the town of Brandenburg, closed its sessions by an armed force under Wrangel (November), and finally dissolved it shortly after its reassembling in Brandenburg (Dec. 5), promulgating a liberal constitution of his own (*octroyirte Verfassung*). The last act of the assembly of Berlin, the decree ordering the refusal of taxes (Nov. 15), remained without effect; the new elections took place according to the king's constitution, and the two chambers were convened in Berlin (Feb. 26, 1849), which remained in a state of siege. Of these the lower house was still too revolutionary, and both were dissolved (April 27). In the mean time the king had not only abandoned the cause of Schleswig-Holstein by the armistice of Malmoe, but had also refused to accept the hereditary imperial crown of Germany offered him (March 28) by the Frankfort parliament. The Prussian army now suppressed the revolution in Dresden, after a bloody struggle of 3 days (May), and in the Palatinate and Baden (June), while it was almost a mere spectator in the renewed struggle in Schleswig-Holstein. A confederation of Prussia with Saxony and Hanover (*Dreikönigsbund*, confederation of three kings), and some minor northern states, formed March 26, was hailed by the so called party of Gotha (Gagern, Dahlmann, &c.) as the last anchor of hope for a union of Germany. It ended in failure. Opposed by Austria and its southern allies, it was given up by Saxony, Hanover, and others; its parliament of Erfurt assembled in vain (March 20, 1850). Frederic William, who had in the mean time convoked a new Prussian assembly and confirmed a new constitution with his royal oath (Feb. 6), followed for some time a more popular course in the affairs of Hesse-Cassel (October), but soon yielded to the threats of Austria and her allies (November). Order was restored in Hesse and Schleswig-Holstein, and the ancient Germanic diet was once more established in Frankfort. The revolution was over. A second attempt on the life of the king by Sefeloge (1850) had no connection with it. Only Neufchâtel remained with Switzerland as a conquest of the movement, and was finally, after some threats of war in 1857, ceded to that republic. The policy of the government was peaceful, and Prussia took no part in the war in Turkey, though it participated in the peace of Paris (1856). The constitution was modified and remodified; the revolutionary members of the assembly of 1848, Jacoby and others, were persecuted; the nobility (*die Junker*) and the pietists received new influence; the freedom of the press and of religion was circumscribed. In 1857 the king was seized by a malady connected with temporary insanity, which increasing by degrees, compelled him (Oct 23, 1858) to give up the personal manage-

ment of affairs, and to repair for the restoration of his health to the Tyrol and subsequently to Italy. His marriage with Elizabeth, princess of Bavaria, being without issue, his brother William, prince of Prussia, born March 22, 1797, became regent. The son of the regent, and heir presumptive to the throne in case of the expected abdication of the king, Prince Frederic William (born Oct. 18, 1831), married Victoria, princess royal of Great Britain (born Nov. 21, 1840), Jan. 25, 1858.

V. SAXONY.

FREDERIC III., surnamed the Wise, elector of Saxony, born in Torgau, Jan. 17, 1463, died May 5, 1525. He succeeded his father Ernest, in 1486, only in a part of his possessions, governing the rest in common with his brother John the Constant, who also became his successor. He was the founder of the university of Wittenberg, and though not an avowed adherent of the reformation, greatly promoted it by his protection. He procured safety for Luther during the diet of Worms, and subsequently sheltered him in the castle of Wartburg. His influence with the emperor Charles V. was due particularly to the circumstance that after the death of Maximilian I. he had refused to accept the crown of Germany, which was conferred, according to his advice, upon that monarch. The peasants' war embittered the last days of his life.

FREDERIC AUGUSTUS I., 1st king of Saxony, eldest son of the elector Frederic Christian, born Dec. 23, 1750, died May 5, 1827. He succeeded his father in Dec. 1763, under the tutelage of Prince Xaver, was declared of age Sept. 15, 1768, and in the following year married Maria Amalia, princess of Deux Ponts. The only fruit of this marriage was a daughter, the princess Augusta. The claims of his mother to the possessions of her deceased brother, the elector Maximilian Joseph of Bavaria, induced him to ally himself with Frederic the Great against Austria in the short war of the Bavarian succession. Subsequently he joined the league of princes (*Fürstenbund*) formed under the protectorate of the Prussian monarch. In 1791 he refused to accept the succession to the throne of Poland, offered him in the name of that country by Prince Adam Casimir Czartoryski. He also rejected the instances of a conference of the emperors Leopold II. and Frederic William II. of Prussia, held at Pilnitz (1791), to join as an independent sovereign the first coalition against the French revolution, though he did not withhold his contingent as a member of the German empire when the war had been declared. In 1796 he took part in the treaty of peace and neutrality concluded with the French republic by the district of Upper Saxony. He maintained his neutrality during the war of 1805, but in the following year joined Prussia in the unhappy contest decided by the battle of Jena. Saxony, which fell into the hands of the French conqueror, was severely punished, and Frederic Augustus was finally

the perpendicular distance from the bung to the surface of the liquor.

GAUL (GALLIA), the name applied by the Romans to two great divisions of their empire, distinguished from each other by the designations Cisalpine and Transalpine (in regard to Rome). Of these, Cisalpine Gaul (Gallia Cisalpina or Citerior), comprising the north of Italy to the confines of Etruria and Umbria, was divided by the Po (Padus) into Cispadane and Transpadane. It was also called Gallia Togata, or Romanized Gaul, from the inhabitants wearing togas like the Romans, and in contradistinction to the S. E. province of the Transalpine country, which was called Braccata from the *braccæ* or wide trousers of its people. It was bounded N. W. and N. by the Alps, E. by the Athesis (now Adige), S. E. by the Adriatic, S. by the Rubicon, the Appenines, the Macra (now Magra), and the mountains of Liguria. Transalpine Gaul (Gallia Transalpina or Ulterior) was bounded W. and N. by the sea, E. by the Rhine, S. E. by the Alps, and S. by the Mediterranean and the Pyrénées, thus comprising not only the whole of modern France and Belgium, but also parts of Sardinia, Switzerland, Germany, and Holland. Both divisions were inhabited mostly by people of Celtic race (Gaelic and Kymric), called by the Romans in general Gauls (Galli), by the Greeks *Κέλται* or *Γαλαται*; the Celto-Teutonic, Teutonic, Celto-Iberian, Iberian, Tuscan, Greek, and other elements of the population were comparatively small. (See *CELTÆ*.) These Celts or Gauls, a branch of the great Indo-European family of nations, had left their Asiatic homes at a period preceding the dawn of European history, and had occupied the western regions on the Rhine, Seine, Rhone and Garonne, Ebro and Tagus, as well as the islands of Britain, when the Roman state was still in its infancy. Of a turbulent, roving, and warlike disposition, they had scarcely settled on the shores of the Atlantic, which stopped their migration westward, when some of their tribes commenced entering northern Italy, according to Livy, under Belovesus, a nephew of King Ambigatus, in the time of Tarquin the Elder. Others are said by the same historian to have taken their direction toward the Hercynian forest, under Sigovesus, another nephew of Ambigatus. Still others appear later, it is uncertain whence coming, in Macedon, Thrace, and Greece, where they burned Delphi, 279 B. C., and even in Asia Minor, where they founded Galatia or Gallo-Græcia, in Syria, and in Egypt. Tall, impetuous, and extremely reckless, with long hair and mustaches, they appeared terrible, not only to the effeminate people of the eastern countries, but to the Romans themselves. They fought on horseback, armed with large bucklers, lances, and swords. They were fond of adventure, greedy of gold, and boastful, made the use of arms a profession, served as mercenaries even in Carthage, and challenged foes and friends to single combats. Even where they were settled they preferred hunting and grazing to

agriculture. They were quick of temper, sudden in resolution, and inconstant, and therefore apt to conquer, but not to keep, to destroy, but not to make lasting foundations. There are no precise historical dates for the consecutive invasions of Cisalpine Gaul by the Celts; they are supposed to have occupied several centuries. Tribe followed tribe, and finally we find the Salassians settled in the vicinity of Ivrea (Eporedia), the Insubrians about Milan (Mediolanum), the Cenomani in the region of Verona and Mantua, the Boii in the country now forming the duchies of Parma and Modena and about Bologna (Bononia), the Lingones about Ravenna, the Senones, who came last, in the S. E. of Cispadane Gaul, and other tribes in various other parts of the country. It was not long after the conquest of Veii by the Romans that this people came in contact with the Gauls. These invaders had conquered the northern possessions of the Etruscan confederacy while the Romans were making their attacks on its southern districts. They had pushed the Umbrians southward, taken Melpum (396 B. C.), crossed the Apennines under one of their Brenni, and advanced as far as Clusium. The Tuscans of this city now sought aid from the Romans, who, however, sent no army to their assistance, but despatched the Fabii as envoys to deter the barbarians. The envoys only provoked them, and drew their sword upon Rome. Brennus broke up the camp before Clusium, crossed the Tiber, routed the Romans on the Allia, entered Rome through open gates, and pillaged it; but finally, after an obstinate siege of the capitol, he sold his conquest for gold and retired with his army. Rome long and well remembered the "day of the Allia" (July 18) and all the terrors of the first Gallic invasion. All others proved disastrous to the barbarians. In 367 they were routed near Alba by the old Marcus Camillus, who won there his last victory. In 361 another host, like the first of the Senonian tribe, encamped before the Anio bridge, but marched further toward Campania before fighting a battle. Shortly after returning from Campania they renewed their ravages, and fought unsuccessfully against the dictators Ahala and Peticus. In 350 they again encamped before Rome, keeping it in perpetual terror; but in the following year L. Furius Camillus, a nephew of Marcus, compelled them to retire, an event the fame of which reached even the contemporary Aristotle in Greece. When in a later period the Gauls assisted the Umbrians and Etruscans against the more and more advancing Romans, they were routed in the battle of Sentinum (296), where many of them fought on war chariots, and near the lake Vadimon (283). These disasters, suffered chiefly by the Senonian and Boian Gauls, put an end to the Gallic wars in Italy for nearly 60 years. The Romans, who had conquered Umbria, founded their first colony in Cispadane Gaul, in the land of the Senones, calling it Sena Gallica (now Sinigaglia); Ariminum (Rimini) was founded afterward. The Gauls were too

much weakened to offer any opposition. But strengthened by the arrival of large bodies from beyond the Alps, they took up arms again in 225, and crossed the Apennines, but were soon compelled to retreat, and were routed at Telamon. The Romans continued the war with great vigor, conquered the land of the Boii, crossed the Po, on the opposite banks of which they soon after founded Cremona and Placentia (Piacenza), and subdued the Insubrians (221). The details of all these military events, as for instance the single combats of T. Manlius Torquatus (361) and M. Valerius Corvus (349) with gigantic Gauls, belong to the history of Rome, or rather to the legends of its heroes. When Hannibal crossed the Alps (218) he was eagerly joined by numerous Gauls, but after his final defeat (201) Cisalpine Gaul became an easy prey to the victorious legions. It was made a Roman province at the beginning of the following century, received numerous new Roman colonies, became civilized, industrious, and flourishing, and finally obtained the privileges of Roman citizenship. Of the 11 divisions of Italy, as established under Augustus, it formed the last four. The Salassians, who revolted under the same reign, were nearly exterminated. The Romanization of the province was rapidly developed, and many celebrated Romans of the later period were its natives, as for instance Livy, who was born at Patavium (Padua) in 58 B. C.—Of Transalpine Gaul, upon the southern coast of which Phœnicians, Rhodians, and Phocæans had, at various remote periods, carried colonies and some rudiments of civilization, the arts of writing, mining, and working metals, the olive and the vine, the Romans first entered the S. E. angle. In 166 B. C. the Maritime Alps were first crossed by Roman legions, who defeated the tribes of the western slopes. In 154 they defended Massilia (Marseilles), a colony of Phocæa, and herself the mother of numerous colonies, against the Ligurians. Twenty years later they fought against the Salyes, a Celto-Ligurian tribe. Soon after they founded Aquæ Sextiæ (Aix), and subdued the Allobroges, who lived between the Rhone (Rhodanus) and the Isère (Isara), and were assisted by the Arverni (121). This new course of Roman conquests was interrupted by the great Cimbri-Teutonic movement (see CIMBRI), but the two victories of Marius at Aquæ Sextiæ (102) and on the Raudian fields (101), over the Teutons and Cimbri, saved both the Transalpine and Cisalpine possessions of Rome. The former, eventually extending from the Alps to the Pyrénées, and embracing the modern provinces of Dauphiny, Languedoc, Provence (from the Roman *Provincia*), Roussillon, and Nice, were called Gallia Braccata or Comata, from the long hair (*coma*) of the inhabitants. The internal development of the main parts of Transalpine Gaul, during the times when the Cisalpine country was successively Gallicized and Romanized, cannot be traced in historical records. When the Romans,

in the last period of the history of their republic, finally entered the great north-west, they found the country occupied by various tribes, ruled by nobles, priests, and chiefs or kings. Cæsar, the conqueror of the people and the historian of their last desperate struggles for independence, comprehends all of them under the general name of Gauls, dividing them, however, into the 3 large groups of Belgians, in the N. E. between the Rhine, Seine (Sequana), and Marne (Matrona); Celts, or Gauls proper; in the centre and west, between the Seine, Marne, and Garonne (Garumna); and Aquitanians, in the S. W., between the Garonne and the Pyrénées. In the first of these groups Kymric and Belgic elements seem to have prevailed, in the second Gaelic, in the third Iberic and other non-Celtic elements, though the divisions of Cæsar do not fully coincide with the lines of distinction drawn by modern ethnologists. Among the more important tribes were the Batavi, near the mouths of the Rhine; the Nervii, in the S. W. of modern Belgium; the Eburones, about Liège; the Ambiani, about Amiens; the Morini, "the remotest of men," about Boulogne; the Atreates, in Artois; the Bellovaci, about Beauvais; the Suessiones, about Soissons; the Parisii, about Paris (Lutetia); the Remi, in Champagne (Rheims); the Treveri, about Treves; the Teutonic Tribocci, Ubii, and Nemetes, on the Rhine; the Ebuovices, about Evreux; the Cenomani, in Maine; the Armorican Nannetes (Nantes), Veneti (Vannes), and Redones (Reunes), the chief representatives of the Kymric race, in Brittany; the Turones, in Touraine; the Andes or Andegavi, in Anjou; the Carnutes, about Chartres and Orleans; the Lingones, about Langres; the Senones, about Sens (Agendicum); the Lemovices, in Limousin; the Santones, in Saintonge; the Pictones, in Poitou; the Arverni, in Auvergne; the Helvii, in Vivarais; the Gabali, in Gévaudan; the Ædui, in the region of Autun (Bibracte); the Mandubii, about Sainte Reine and Alise (Alesia); the Insubres, in Lyonnais; the Bituriges, in earlier times a leading tribe, about Bourges (Avaricum); the Sequani, about Besançon (Vesontio); the Helvetii, in Switzerland; the Bituriges Vivisci, about Bordeaux (Burdigala); and the Tarbelli, in Béarn.—Compared with their eastern neighbors, the Germans, the Gauls had reached a certain degree of culture at the time of Cæsar's invasion. They had towns, and used the art of fortification with success; they had long known the arts of embroidering and working metals, and were regarded as the inventors of various implements of husbandry; the Armoricians possessed a navy; the Gallic country was reputed to be the richest in Europe. The Romans, however, were fully entitled to call them barbarians. Their manners were rude, their speech was rough and hardly intelligible, milk and flesh of swine were the principal aliments, their villages were adorned or rather disfigured with inhuman trophies, the treatment of captive or slain enemies was bar-

barous, bloody fights and duels were customary, hounds were used in war, polygamy was not prohibited, and females were little more than slaves; the polytheism which prevailed among the common people, especially among the Gael, was ruder than that of Italy; the mysteries of the druids, whose influence prevailed chiefly among the Kymri, were stranger than those of the augurs, and the altars of the gods smoked with the blood of human victims. (See DRUIDS, and BARD.) The remains commemorative of Gallic culture are extremely scanty, and many a French writer of the romantic school has tried in vain to shed lustre over the life and character of the people who, with their successive conquerors, the Romans and Franks, were the ancestors of the French nation. The chief national features of resemblance are vivacity and rapidity in resolution and action, and great love of military glory. It must also be acknowledged that in the defence of their native soil and independence the Gauls of the 1st century B. C. developed the same dauntless and desperate courage and resolution which made the France of the revolution invincible. The absence, however, of national union and centralization, and the genius of a Cæsar in the camp of the enemy, led to their conquest. The details of that bloody war may be read in the "Commentaries" of the great Roman general himself. Its chief events (as far as regards Gaul) are the defeat of the Helvetians in the murderous battle near Bibracte, and the expedition against the Suevi under Ariovistus undertaken on the call of the Ædui, in 58; the conquest of Belgic Gaul in 57; the invasion of Armorica or Brittany by land and sea, the submission of Aquitania, and the reduction of the wild tribes on the N. E. coast, in 56; the sudden and successful attacks of the Eburones under Ambiorix, and their annihilation, in 53 and 52; the great rising of central Gaul under Vercingetorix, the double blockade at Alesia, and the fall of Avaricum, the last stronghold of the natives, in 52 and 51. The loss of the Gauls in these struggles, in which genius and discipline conquered unbridled and tumultuous valor, was little less than a million of men. The whole Transalpine country was divided by Augustus into 4 provinces: Gallia Narbonensis (Narbonne), the former *Provincia Romana*, Gallia Aquitania, Gallia Lugdunensis, and Gallia Belgica, to which were added later the divisions Germania Superior or Prima, and Germania Inferior or Secunda, on the Rhine. Other subsequent divisions are less important. For more than 2 centuries after its conquest by Cæsar, Gaul remained almost entirely quiet, and its Romanization progressed rapidly, the national habits and religion retiring by degrees toward the shores of the north-western sea, and eventually finding refuge in the islands beyond it. The history of the country in the times of the Roman emperors, under the later of whom it was Christianized, belongs to that of Rome. Civil wars and dissensions in the 3d

century, and later the invasions of the Alemanni, Franks, Burgundians, Visigoths, Huns, and other barbarians, brought about its decay. Clovis made it Frankish. (See FRANCE.)

GAUSS, KARL FRIEDRICH, a German mathematician, born in Brunswick, April 30, 1777, died in Göttingen, Feb. 23, 1855. He early displayed such remarkable capacity for mathematical calculation, that (his parents being poor) the duke of Brunswick took charge of his education. At the age of 18, while a student at Göttingen, he solved a problem which had occupied geometers from the time of Euclid, that of the division of the circle into 17 equal parts. In 1801 he published his *Disquisitiones Arithmeticæ*, treating of indeterminate analysis or transcendental arithmetic, and containing, beside many new and curious theorems, a demonstration of the famous theorem of Fermat concerning triangular numbers. It gave him at once a distinguished place among scientific men. He was one of the first to calculate, by a new method, the orbit of the newly discovered planet Ceres, and afterward that of Pallas, for which he received from the French institute in 1810 the medal founded by Lalande. In 1807 he was appointed professor of mathematics and director of the new observatory at Göttingen, a position which he retained till his death. His profound works, though produced with a rapidity that astonished the savants of Europe, were elaborated with the greatest care, and many of them mark an era in the history of science. He wrote only on mathematics, but was also interested in politics and literature, loved to read the newspapers and converse on the events of the day, and is said to have been exasperated that any credit was given to the accounts of table-tippings at a time when so many efforts were made to enlighten the public by popularizing the sciences. From the year 1828 he never left Göttingen, and he did not see a locomotive till 1854. As a mathematician, he was pronounced by Laplace the greatest in Europe. Among the more important of his works are *Theoria Motus Corporum Cælestium* (Hamburg, 1809; translated into English by C. H. Davis, Boston, 1857); *Intensitas Vis Magneticae Terrestris* (Göttingen, 1833); *Dioptrische Untersuchungen* (Göttingen, 1841); and *Untersuchungen über Gegenstände der höhern Geodesie* (Göttingen, 1844). Being appointed to measure a degree in Hanover, he rendered the most distant stations visible by means of the heliotrope, an instrument of his invention for reflecting solar light; and in connection with Weber he made valuable investigations concerning terrestrial magnetism.

GAUTAMA. See BUDDHISM AND BUDDHA.

GAUTIER, THÉOPHILE, a French writer, born in Tarbes, Aug. 31, 1811. He studied painting, but in 1828 gave up the brush for the pen, and published a small volume of poems, remarkable for picturesque originality. An eccentric and somewhat licentious novel, *Mlle. de Maupin*, which caused a considerable sensation was the

of Smith were unsuccessful, but in 1616 Gorges sent out Richard Vines with a party, which encamped on the river Saco through the winter, and in 1619-'20 Capt. Dermer again made the voyage. The pilgrims had obtained their original patent from the London company, which had incurred the resentment of the king, so that in 1620 Gorges and his associates obtained a new incorporation for "the governing of New England in America," which was empowered to hold territory extending westward from sea to sea between the 40th and 48th parallels N. lat. From this council the pilgrims received a new patent, by which each colonist was to pay a yearly rent of 2 shillings an acre after 7 years. Gorges himself, pursuing his plans of territorial aggrandizement, united with John Mason in taking grants of the district called Laconia, bounded by the Merrimack, the Kennebec, the ocean, and "the river of Canada," and under his auspices several settlements were attempted. His son, Capt. Robert Gorges, was appointed in 1623 by the council for New England "general governor of the country." This council resigned its charter to the king in 1635, surrendering the administration of its domains to a governor-general to be appointed by him, and Gorges vainly expected this appointment. He now determined to establish a miniature sovereignty on his own domain. To this end he obtained from the king a charter constituting him lord proprietary of the province of Maine, with extraordinary governmental powers, which were to be transmissible with the property to his heirs and assigns. He was ruler in church and state, which were instituted on hierarchal and monarchical models, and he flattered himself that he had now attained "what he had travelled for above 40 years." He sent his son Thomas to be deputy governor, and the officers took an oath of allegiance to the lord proprietary. The province was divided into 2 counties, of which Agamenticus (now York) and Saco were respectively the principal settlements; the former received a city charter, as Gorgeana, in 1642. But the fatal want was a deficiency of subjects; probably two-thirds of the adult males were in places of authority; yet the little monarchy continued for nearly 10 years. When the 4 New England colonies formed a confederacy in 1643, the settlements of Gorges were excluded from it, "because," says Winthrop, "they ran a different course from us both in their ministry and their civil administration," and because the proprietary was then in arms in England for the king against the cause of the Puritans. On his death the people repeatedly wrote to his heirs, but as no answer was received, they at length formed themselves into a body politic for the purposes of self-government, and submitted to the jurisdiction of Massachusetts. "The nature of Gorges," says Bancroft, "was generous, and his piety sincere. He sought pleasure in doing good, fame by advancing Christianity among the heathen, a durable monument by erecting houses, villages, and towns."

GÖRGEY, or GÖRGEI, ARTHUR, a Hungarian general and dictator, born in Toporecz, in the county of Zips, Feb. 5, 1818, of a noble Lutheran family. Having gone through a course of study at the gymnasium of Eperies, he entered the military school at Tulu, and subsequently the royal Hungarian noble life guards at Vienna, and after a service of a few years was appointed lieutenant in the regiment of Palatine hussars. But he soon left the army to devote himself to chemical studies at Prague, where he married a young French lady, with whom he returned to his native county in the north of Hungary. Here he spent the spring of 1848 without any participation in the early events of the Hungarian revolution; but when the intrigues of the Vienna cabinet and the reactionary insurrections of the non-Magyar tribes in the south of Hungary had compelled the first Hungarian ministry (Batthyányi-Kossuth) to declare the country in danger, he offered his services to the national government. He received the rank of captain, and was attached to the 5th battalion of Honvéds, which was forming at Raab. He was soon after ordered to Pesth and intrusted with various commissions for procuring flint muskets, fusees, and percussion caps, and after his return from an official journey to Prague and Wiener-Neustadt in Aug. 1848, he was reappointed at his own request to the camp service, and received the command of the mobile national guard of the circle W. of the Theiss, with the rank of Honvéd major. His chief station was Szolnok. Detached to the island of Csepel, formed by the Danube, to defend that line against the Croats of Ban Jellachich, he evinced an almost ostentatious revolutionary rigor by the execution of Count Eugene Zichy, who was brought before him as an accomplice of Jellachich, tried by a court martial, condemned, and hanged (Sept. 30). The ban having been defeated at Pákozd, and having fled toward Vienna, Görgey operated with Perczel against the thus abandoned Croatian corps under Roth and Philippovich, which finally surrendered at Ozora (Oct. 7). The great merit of the young officer in this successful operation, his energy, resoluteness, and ability, made Kossuth, then at the head of the committee of defence, overlook the stubborn independence of his superiors which he already displayed, and detaching him from Perczel, with whom he had quarrelled, he sent him as colonel to the army of the upper Danube, which, pursuing Jellachich, was about to cross the frontier for the deliverance of Vienna. Not fully confiding in the chief commander, Móga, Kossuth intrusted Görgey with the command of the vanguard, and after the defeat at Schwechat, near Vienna (Oct. 30), which decided the fate of that capital, made him general-in-chief of the whole army, which was charged with defending the frontier. Görgey's force, however, consisting mainly of unorganized militia, already dispirited by defeat, was unfit to maintain a long line of defence against the superior and victorious army of

Prince Windischgrätz, and was threatened at the same time on both flanks by the simultaneous advance of Simunich and Nugent. Having restored order by rigorous measures, and the courage of his troops by a few skirmishes, he abandoned the frontier on the approach of Windischgrätz (Dec. 16), giving up the hastily established defensive works at Presburg, and subsequently those of Wieselburg and Raab, and retreated on the high road leading along the right bank of the Danube toward Buda, being closely followed by the enemy. This march was interrupted only by the unimportant engagements at Wieselburg (Dec. 18), Bábolna (Dec. 28), and Tétény in the vicinity of the Hungarian capital (Jan. 3, 1849). This, too, was now given up, in spite of the encouraging issue of the last engagement, chiefly in consequence of the rout of Perczel's corps, which on its retreat from the line of the Drave had been surprised and dispersed at Moor (Dec. 29) before its junction with Görgey. According to a new plan of operations adopted in a council of war held at Pesth, Görgey, giving up a part of his troops to Perczel, who had to defend the Theiss in the direction of Debreczin, the new seat of the Hungarian government, crossed the Danube at Pesth, with the principal part of his corps, and marched along the left bank of this river, toward the Waag. His object was to divert the main army of the enemy by threatening its rear, from a decisive march toward the Theiss, to deliver the fortress of Leopoldstadt on the Waag, and to drive back Simunich, who was operating on that line. The task was arduous, and the ambitious young general felt that he held the fate of his country in his hands. He was determined to save its military honor, but he had neither hope nor sympathy for its national independence. His thoroughly German education, and his almost exclusively German associations in the higher ranks of the army, made him a stranger among his countrymen, of whose history, literature, and even language he knew but little. A strong will, incapable of subordination, a proud conviction of his own superior abilities, and a superciliously sarcastic turn of mind, made him inclined to despise popular agitations, public opinion, and democratic ideas, and to scorn every measure of the revolutionary leaders of Hungary, and especially of Kossuth, who owed his dictatorial power to eloquence, democratic enthusiasm, and popular sympathy. Of principles he knew but one, that of military honor. Military glory, more than power, was the aim of his ambition. But what he was the most anxious about was complete personal independence. He had scarcely reached with his army the first isolated position at Waitzen, when he gave vent to his feelings, and at the same time defined his position by a manifesto in the form of a "declaration of the royal Hungarian *corps d'armée* of the upper Danube," of which the chief points, directed at the same time against the new, unconstitutional reign of Francis Joseph, who had been declared emperor

at Olmütz on Dec. 2, 1848, and against the republican tendencies of Kossuth, were the following: "1. The *corps d'armée* of the upper Danube remains faithful to its oath to fight resolutely against every external enemy for the maintenance of the constitution of the kingdom of Hungary sanctioned by King Ferdinand V. 2. With the same resolution the *corps d'armée* of the upper Danube will oppose itself to all those who may attempt to overthrow the constitutional monarchy by untimely republican intrigues in the interior of the country. . . . 4. The *corps d'armée* of the upper Danube, mindful of the oath taken to the constitution of Hungary, and mindful of its own honor, having remained perfectly conscious of what it has to do and is determined to do, declares, finally, that it will adhere to the result of any convention made with the enemy, only provided on the one hand that it guarantees the integrity of the constitution of Hungary to which the *corps d'armée* has sworn, and on the other, is not inimical to the military honor of the *corps d'armée* itself." This proclamation, which had the merit of appeasing the scruples of the old troops, formerly Austrian, startled the committee of defence and the nation by the mention of a convention with the enemy; and all the subsequent services of the general, who seemed thus preparing to play the part of another Monk, could not free him from the general suspicion of meditated treason, accompanied as they continually were by acts of flagrant disobedience to the revolutionary government. He was, however, protected by the various perplexities of the government, by his isolated situation, and the sympathies of his army. But his situation was not less critical than that of the government. On Jan. 10 both his vanguard, under Aulich, and his rear guard, under Guyon, had to fight, the former against the vanguard of Simunich, at Verebély, and the latter against that of the pursuing column under Chorich, at Ipolyság. The army, consisting of about 15,000 men, was soon hemmed in, in the midst of winter, among the mountain towns of the mining district between the Gran, Danube, and Waag, where the hostile corps of Chorich, Götz, Simunich, and Schlick surrounded them from every quarter. The offensive march westward was given up, Leopoldstadt abandoned to the besieging enemy, and a bold retreat toward the upper Theiss commenced, through rugged mountains, across overflowing streams, and amid continual fighting. After the defeat of Guyon at Windschacht (Jan. 21), and of Görgey at Hodrics, where he was left alone (Jan. 22), all the 3 divisions of the army were on the brink of destruction, and all escaped as by a miracle, effecting their junction at Neusohl. They owed their escape more to the intrepidity of the leaders, Görgey, Aulich, and Guyon, than to the valor of the soldiers, who were in great part undisciplined recruits. Separating again, they marched toward the northernmost Hungarian region of the Carpathians, and entered the

Zips, Görgey's native county, at the beginning of February. Having here been surprised at Igló on the night between Feb. 2 and 3, and suffered some inconsiderable loss, Guyon soon after (Feb. 5) saved the army by his signal victory on Mount Branyiszkó over a division of Schlick's corps, which opened a junction with the Hungarian corps under Klapka operating against that Austrian general on the upper Theiss. Görgey, who had systematically neglected the difficult communication with the government at Debreczin, and contemptuously disbelieved the non-official reports of the successful operations of Klapka, too late concerted with the latter a common plan of attack, and thus missed the opportunity of crushing Schlick's corps at Káschau. Arrived in that town, Görgey received an order from the government placing him, like Perczel and Klapka, under the Polish general Dembinski, as commander-in-chief of the united Hungarian main army; the corps of the upper Danube received the name of 7th corps. Görgey obeyed reluctantly, but immediately began intrigues in his camp against the foreign generalissimo, which much deranged the offensive plans of the latter. Dembinski doubted the fidelity of Görgey; the latter had no confidence in the ability of his superior. The unfavorable issue of the two days' battle of Kápolna (Feb. 26, 27) was ascribed by the one to unskilful dispositions, by the other to treacherous slowness in execution. The events which followed the retreat to Kövesd and the unimportant battle fought at that place (Feb. 28), as well as his own conduct, are thus characteristically described by Görgey in the contents of the 30th chapter of his memoirs (vol. i.): "Dembinski decrees the retreat beyond the Theiss. Klapka effects it with his divisions (March 2). I delay the retreat of the 7th army corps. Reasons for it. Dembinski countermands the retreat of the 7th army corps. My written declaration against it. I effect the retreat (March 3)." In Fűred-on-the-Theiss the chief officers of the army, mostly partisans of Görgey, openly declared their want of confidence in Dembinski; the government was forced to yield, and after a few weeks of interregnum, during which Gen. Vetter had the nominal chief command, Görgey was appointed general-in-chief of the united main army, which was again to take the offensive against Windischgrätz. Crossing the upper Theiss, he began his march on the line of operation chosen by Dembinski, but with different success. The whole campaign was an uninterrupted series of victories. The battle of Hatvan (April 2), Bicske (4th), Izsaszeg (6th), Waitzen (10th), Nagy-Sarló (19th), and before Comorn (Ács, 26th), won mostly through the undaunted valor of Damjanics and his division, destroyed the finest imperial troops in Hungary, freed Pesth, and rescued the fortress of Comorn. The road to Vienna was open, but Buda had still to be conquered. Görgey undertook the latter task, but when he had executed it (May 21) the Russian

armies were already approaching the frontiers of Hungary, and the opportunity of striking a decisive blow at Austria in its capital was lost. (See BUDA.) Imitating the celebrated report of the conqueror of Praga to Catharine II: "Hurrah! Praga! Suwaroff," he announced his conquest to the government in Debreczin with the words: "Éljen! Buda! Görgey!" Kossuth, in his turn, imitated the "Bravo, field marshal! Catharine" of the Russian empress, by conferring on Görgey the title of lieutenant field marshal. This Görgey refused to accept, as incompatible with republican simplicity, thus ridiculing the republican policy of Kossuth and Szemere, the new prime minister. It was against that policy of republican independence, as sanctioned by the declaration of the Debreczin diet on April 14, as well as Kossuth's favorite scheme of "making Poland free, that Hungary might remain and Europe might become so" (Görgey's memoirs, vol. ii. ch. xii.), that the energies of Görgey were at that period chiefly directed. Having strengthened his personal position by assuming also the duties of minister of war, and by the removal from his army of some of the most independent and ablest of his generals, he recommenced the offensive against the Austrians simultaneously with the invasion of the Russians. Political rather than strategical reasons led him to choose the left bank of the Danube as a basis of operations, rejecting the repeated advice of Klapka to the contrary, and he changed his plan only after a series of bloody and fruitless struggles on the Waag and Danube (June 16, 20, 21). On the right bank of the latter river his army was forced to give up Raab (June 28), and he was obliged to retreat into the fortified camp at Comorn, where he gained more glory than success in the great battle of Szöny (July 2), in which he was wounded. At this juncture, when Russians and Austrians were advancing from every quarter, a concentration of the main armies on the Theiss was resolved upon at Pesth; Mészáros received the nominal, and his friend Dembinski the virtual command in chief; the capital was again evacuated, and Görgey was finally compelled to sacrifice his plans. Leaving a part of his army under Klapka at Comorn, he retreated toward Waitzen, where he fought (July 15) with distinction against the Russian main army under Paskevitch; but being unable to break through it, he took his direction toward the upper Theiss, this time in the middle of a hot summer, defeated the Russians on the Sajó (July 25) and on the Hernád (July 28), and crossed the Theiss at Tokaj, but not before the Russians had crossed it at Fűred. The division of Nagy-Sándor was soon after surprised and defeated at Debreczin (Aug. 2); and when Görgey finally reached Arad, the last appointed place of concentration, as well as the last seat of the Hungarian government, his army alone was still able to fight, all the others which had been ordered there having been defeated and dispersed; Bem had even lost Transylvania. To resist with success the overwhelming forces

of Paskevitch and Haynau, which surrounded him, was now impossible, and he immediately resolved to prevent a protracted and perhaps shameful agony of the bleeding country by an act which he knew would brand his name before the world with the infamy of treason. Having summoned Kossuth to resign, he received from him (Aug. 11) supreme civil and military powers, and with the consent of his chief officers informed the Russian general Rüdiger of his intention to surrender his army at discretion to the commanders of the czar. In his letter he appealed to the magnanimity and love of justice of the latter in behalf of the nation and his fellow officers, excepting his own person, expressed his determination to surrender only to Russian troops, and indicated his line of march for the next few days, in order to be separated by Rüdiger from the Austrians, whom he was still resolved to repulse if he could not avoid meeting them. The last commands were executed by the army, which had so long been victorious, in silent despair. The march to Világos, the place of surrender, was "unusually retarded by the oppressive sultriness of the atmosphere; the sky was unclouded and not a breath of air stirring; beside, they had nothing more to lose." When the last division arrived, the sun was just setting; "and in the twilight of Aug. 13, 1849, General Count Rüdiger inspected the surrendered army," about 20,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry, with 130 cannon. "The cavalry were dismounted, and had their swords hung on the pommels of their saddles; the muskets of the infantry were piled in pyramids; the artillery was drawn close together and unmanned; the flags and standards lay there unprotected before the disarmed ranks." The flags and standards were carried as trophies to Moseow; the generals and soldiers were delivered to the Austrians, the former to be executed at Arad (Oct. 6), the latter to serve a new term in their army. Görgey alone was spared at the intercession of the czar, and carried as captive to Klagenfurth in Carinthia, where he is still detained. Of his two brothers, who served with distinction under him, one was sentenced to imprisonment, the other to serve in the army. In Klagenfurth, where he also resumed his chemical studies, Görgey composed his memoirs in German, which were published under the title of "My Life and Acts in Hungary in the Years 1848 and 1849" (2 vols., Leipsic, 1852; English ed., 2 vols., London, 1852). This work is intended to vindicate his course during the war.

GORGIAS, a Greek rhetorician and sophist, born in Leontini, in Sicily, about 487 B. C., died about 380. He was a disciple of Empedocles and Prodicus, and first appears in history in 427, when he was sent to Athens to beseech succor for the Leontines attacked by the Syracusans. He not only captivated by the splendor of his eloquence the Athenian populace, but gained Alcibiades, Alcidas, Æschines, and Antisthenes for pupils or imitators. Plato gave

his name to the dialogue which he composed against the sophists.

GORGONS, three sisters, daughters of Phoreys and Ceto, who had according to the fable but one eye in common, and changed into stone whomsoever they looked upon. Homer mentions but one gorgon, which appears as a hideous phantom in Hades, and whose head, of frightful aspect, was represented on the ægis of Athena. Hesiod mentions three, Stheno, Euryale, and Medusa, who had hissing serpents for hair, brazen claws, short wings, and a single tusk-like tooth. They were placed in the garden of the Hesperides near the realm of night, where they were slain by Perseus. Virgil places the gorgons with the harpies and other monsters at the gate of the palace of Pluto.

GORILLA, the largest of the anthropoid apes, a native of the equatorial region of western Africa, and first introduced to the scientific world by Dr. T. S. Savage in 1847. There were vague reports by voyagers and travellers of the existence in Africa of a quadrumanous animal larger than the chimpanzee, and there were in museums portions of a creature since ascertained to be the gorilla; but naturalists had their attention first called to it by the paper by Dr. Savage in vol. v. of the "Boston Journal of Natural History," in which he described the external characters and habits, and Prof. Jeffries Wyman described 4 crania and several parts of the skeleton. Since then Prof. Owen has described the skeleton in vols. iii. and iv. of the "Transactions of the Zoological Society of London" (1849-'53); a description of a large skeleton is given in vol. vi. of the "Boston Journal" above alluded to (1852). In France, Duvernoy wrote on the anatomy of the gorilla in vols. xxxvi. and xxxvii. of the *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences* (1853); and Isidore Geoffroy St. Hilaire has contributed a very full account of its habits, osteology, and comparative anatomy in vol. x. of the *Archives du muséum d'histoire naturelle* (1858). The reader is referred to these papers for details of great interest on this remarkable animal. Dr. Savage described it as *trogloodytes gorilla*; Prof. Owen called it *T. Savagei*, retaining it in the same genus with the chimpanzee; Geoffroy St. Hilaire established for it the genus *gorilla* in 1852, and in 1853 gave it the name of *G. gina*, which is the best known, though *G. Savagei* has a prior claim. The common names of the gorilla among the natives of the region where it is found are engeena, geena, and engeela. There are specimens of the animal, more or less complete, in the collections at Philadelphia, Boston, London, and Paris; and Mr. Paul B. Du Chaillu, who returned to the United States in Aug. 1859, from the country about the Gaboon river, brought with him several complete specimens, male and female, both skins and skeletons, in excellent preservation. They were among the fruits of 4 years' travel in that region, undertaken chiefly with a view to discoveries in natural history. Mr. Du Chaillu is the first white man who has

certante for 9 instruments in one day; the "Messiah" in 23 days; and "Samson," begun only 11 days afterward, in 35.—Victor Schoelcher's elaborate biography of Handel appeared in London in 1857, and the 1st volume of a new work on him by Chrysander in Leipsic in 1858. Mrs. Bray's "Handel, his Life, Personal and Professional," was published in London shortly after the great Handel festival at the crystal palace in June, 1857. The centennial anniversary of his death was celebrated in London on a gigantic scale in 1859.

HANG-CHOW-FOO, a city of China, capital of the province of Che-Kiang, 2 m. from the river Tsien-tang-kiang, and 40 m. from its mouth in the bay of Hang-chow, at the S. terminus of the imperial canal; lat. 30° 21' N., long. 120° 8' E.; pop. estimated at 700,000. It is of an oblong form, well built, and surrounded with a high wall about 8 m. in circuit. In the city are several arches, monuments, and splendid Buddhist temples. It has a large citadel and a garrison consisting of 7,000 troops. The houses are generally one story high and surrounded with gardens. The streets are narrow but paved, and kept tolerably clean, and the shops are large and well stocked. The city has an active trade, and is famous for its manufactures of silks, and particularly taffetas and satins, which are very fashionable, and perhaps more sought for than those of any other city of the province; 60,000 people are engaged in these manufactures alone. The river opposite the city is 4 m. broad at high water, and is remarkable for the rapidity of its flow, the spring night tides rising 30 feet and with a velocity of 7½ knots. Hang-chow-foo is the celebrated Kinsai of Marco Polo, the capital in his time of southern China.

HANKA, WENCESLAW, a Bohemian philologist and critic, born in Horeniewes, June 10, 1791. He distinguished himself in 1817 by the discovery of the "Manuscript of Königshof" (*Rukopis Kralodvorsky*), a collection of beautiful lyric and epic Cechic poems, written about the beginning of the 14th century; and in 1822 he became librarian of the national museum at Prague. He has written a number of grammatical, lexicographical, and critical works on Slavic languages and literature, publishing beside various translations from foreign languages and editions of ancient Cechic literary productions.

HANKE, HENRIETTE WILHELMINE, the most fertile female novelist of Germany, born in Jauer, Prussian Silesia, June 24, 1785. The daughter of a merchant named Arndt, she married in 1814 the Rev. Mr. Hanke, and after the death of her husband (1819) devoted herself to literary pursuits. Her collected works (Hanover, 1841-'56) comprise no fewer than 120 vols., including many novels of a didactic character.

HANNAY, JAMES, an English journalist and novelist, born in Dumfries, Scotland, Feb. 17, 1827. At the age of 13 he entered the navy, but left it after 5 years' service. The work by which he is best known is the novel of "Single-

ton Fontenoy" (1850), which contains much acute delineation of character. Among his other writings are "Biscuit and Grog" (1848); "Claret Cup" (1848); "Hearts are Trumps" (1848); "King Dobbs" (1849); "Sands and Shells" (1854); and 6 lectures on "Satire and Satirists." In 1857 he was an unsuccessful candidate for the representation in parliament of his native borough.

HANNIBAL, a city of Marion co., Mo., on the W. bank of the Mississippi river, 132 m. above St. Louis, and 108 m. N. N. E. from Jefferson City; pop. in 1850, 2,020; in 1859, about 4,500. It is the E. terminus of the Hannibal and St. Joseph railroad, has steamboat communication with Quincy, Ill., 15 m. further up the river, and with St. Louis, and in course of 1859 will have a railroad connection with Quincy. It is favorably situated for commerce, is rapidly increasing, and is the shipping place for large quantities of hemp, tobacco, pork, and other produce of the surrounding country. Coal and carboniferous limestone abound in the neighborhood. Hannibal contains a city hall, a market house, several large tobacco factories, hemp presses, pork packing establishments, flour mills, saw mills, founderies, and machine shops, and in 1850 contained 11 churches (Baptist, Christian, Cumberland Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed, Episcopal, 2 Methodist, 2 Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, and Unitarian), and 5 newspapers.

HANNIBAL, or ANNIBAL, (in Punic, probably, "favorite of Baal"), a Carthaginian general and statesman, born in 247 B. C., died in Nicomedia, Bithynia, in 183. He was the son of Hamilcar Barca, the Carthaginian hero of the first Punic war and leader of the popular party in his state; and the first years of his life were spent amid the impressions caused by the achievements of his father, the disasters which terminated that protracted struggle against Rome, and the horrors of the military mutiny which followed it. Having quelled this mutiny, and prepared for the conquest of Spain, which was to compensate Carthage for the loss of Sicily and Sardinia, Hamilcar, designing to take with him his son, then a boy of 9 years, led him before their departure to an altar, and made him swear eternal enmity to the Romans. Spain, which Hamilcar and his son-in-law and successor in command Hasdrubal conquered as far as the Ebro, at the same time developing its mining and other resources, was an excellent school for the future avenger of his country; and when he took the command himself, on the death of his brother-in-law (221 B. C.), he possessed all the qualities which could promise success to the great military and political schemes of the house of Barca. He united the boldness of youth with the self-possession of old age, the vigor of a soldier with the experience of a general, oriental passion with Greek culture, taciturnity with eloquence, shrewdness with genius; he was patient and temperate to the extreme, a model of chastity, and able alike to conquer by the sword, by stratagem, and by

terror. His first task, when at the head of the great army of Spain, was to complete the conquest of the country S. of the Ebro by the reduction of various tribes and places still hostile to the Carthaginian rule. After a few victories, Saguntum (now Murviedro in Valencia) alone remained to be subdued. This city, a Greek colony, was an ally of Rome; but this was only another inducement for Hannibal to attack it, and at the head of 150,000 men he was strong enough to undertake the siege against the will of his government and the wish of the predominant party in Carthage. Saguntum, after a defence of 8 months, characterized by that desperate valor which has marked the struggles of so many cities in ancient as well as modern Spain, fell while Rome was still deliberating on its rescue (219). Hannibal stained his victory by cruelty, but the rich booty sent to Carthage silenced the accusations of his enemies and augmented the number of the friends of war. Rome demanded in vain the surrender of the young general, and at last through her envoy, Quintus Fabius Maximus, declared war. Thus the second Punic war was begun. Unlike the first, which was waged chiefly for the possession of the islands of the Mediterranean, the genius of Hannibal made it a struggle for the destruction of Rome, which he hoped to achieve by an invasion of Italy from the north, and with the assistance of the half subdued subjects of the tyrannical republic, of whom the Insubrian and Boian Gauls had secretly promised a speedy revolt. Having secured the coasts of Africa by an army of Spaniards, and Spain by another of Africans under his brother Hasdrubal, he started from New Carthage in the spring of 218, with 90,000 foot, 12,000 horse, and 37 elephants, crossed the Ebro, subdued in a series of bloody struggles the warlike tribes of north-eastern Spain, and passed the Pyrénées, leaving Hanno to guard the passes, and dismissing thousands of native Spanish troops to show his confidence of success. His army was now reduced to 59,000 men, with whom he speedily traversed the country between the Pyrénées and the Rhone, crossed that river, unchecked by the hostile Massiliotes, old allies of Rome, and their warlike Gallic neighbors, and, avoiding the cavalry of P. Cornelius Scipio the elder, who had landed on the coast of Gaul, marched up the Rhone and Isère, and through the comparatively level peninsula of the Allobroges between those two rivers to the Alps. It is now generally believed that he crossed the Graian range and the Little St. Bernard, which agrees with the relation of Polybius, although some still hold that his route was across the Cottian range and Mt. Cenis (as Livy relates), or Mt. Genève. The stormy autumn weather and the treachery of the Centrones, a Gallic tribe, greatly augmented the natural horrors of this 15 days' passage of an army consisting in part of horsemen and elephants along narrow paths, between precipices and avalanches, over rocky peaks and ice fields lightly covered with snow.

But the spirit of the general proved equally ingenious in baffling the unexpected assaults of the Gauls, and in contriving artificial means for transporting the army with its trains. Of this, however, no more than 20,000 foot and 6,000 horse could be mustered in the valleys of the Dora Baltea. But the Insubrians and Boians had kept their promise and risen against the Romans; they now readily joined his banners. Having captured Taurinium (Turin), which was hostile to the Insubrians, he defeated Scipio, who had returned with a part of his army from Gaul to meet him on his descent from the Alps, in a cavalry engagement on the Ticino. It was his first battle against Romans, and the first in Italy; and knowing the importance of the first impression, he had inspired his brave Numidian cavalry by a fiery speech. The consul retreated toward the fortified town of Placentia (Fiacenza), but could not prevent his colleague T. Sempronius, after his arrival from Sicily, from accepting a battle on the Trebia, in which the Romans were entrapped into an ambuscade by Mago, the younger brother of Hannibal, and completely routed. Only a part of their army escaped toward the fortresses of the Po. The campaign of the year 218 had thus been a succession of triumphs for Hannibal from the Ebro to the Trebia. The Romans now armed to defend the lines of the Apennines, sending the new consuls of the year 217, Servilius and Flaminius, to Umbria and Etruria, on either of which an attack was expected. Hannibal chose a western passage over the mountains, where he lost all his remaining elephants but one, and having crossed the marshy environs of the Arno, during which perilous march he lost his right eye, he passed by the camp of Flaminius at Arretium (Arezzo), and finally enticed him from his position into a defile between Cortona and Lake Thrasymenus (now the lake of Perugia), where the Romans were suddenly attacked by the Carthaginians in front and rear. Half of the Roman army perished by the sword or in the lake, and the other half was captured, and the consul fell. Four thousand horsemen, the vanguard of Servilius, who was hastening from Umbria to aid his colleague, arrived only to meet the same fate. Rome trembled, and imagined Hannibal already before its gates. (*Hannibal ante portas* became afterward a proverb.) Q. Fabius Maximus, a man who well deserved his surname, was proclaimed dictator by the senate, and the city was fortified. But the conqueror, who knew Rome and the power of its despair, having made an unsuccessful attempt to besiege Spoletum, resolved to detach the subjects and allies of Rome from its interest before attacking the city itself. He therefore crossed over to Picenum, and carried terror and devastation into the lands of the faithful confederates of Rome in central Italy. Fabius now marched against him, and, with that cautious slowness which won him the surname of Cunctator (the Slow),

closely followed all his motions, hovering around him like "a cloud on the mountains," deterring the towns from defection, but carefully avoiding the risk of a decisive battle. By thus keeping Hannibal continually at bay, he procured Rome time for greater armaments. Once he had even the good fortune to surround him closely in a narrow mountain pass; but Hannibal saved himself by having 2,000 oxen with burning fagots around their horns driven upon an eminence, which, making the enemy believe that a sally was intended on that side, induced him to quit one of his main positions. Dissatisfied with the slowness of Fabius, Minucius, his master of the horse, attacked the enemy in his absence at Geronium, and for a trifling success was rewarded by the people of Rome with an equal share in the supreme command. This emboldened him to attempt another attack, and he was soon ensnared and routed by Hannibal, being saved from total ruin only by Fabius, who hastened to the rescue of his rival. Hannibal regarded this as a defeat by Fabius. "I told you," he said, "the cloud of the mountains would shed its lightnings." He wrote to Carthage for reinforcements and money; the government refused to send any, for none were needed, his enemies said, after such victories. Hasdrubal, his brother, was fully engaged in Spain by the brothers P. Cornelius and Cneius Scipio. A decisive battle was deemed necessary by Hannibal to destroy the Roman confederacy. The rashness of C. Terentius Varro, one of the consuls of the year 216, soon offered an opportunity for striking a great blow, of which Hannibal well knew how to avail himself. The battle was fought in Apulia, on the fertile plains of which he had maintained his army through the winter, near Cannæ, on the banks of the Aufidus (Ofanto). The two consuls, L. Æmilius Paulus and Varro, commanded more than 80,000 men; the Carthaginian generals, Hannibal, Mago, Maharbal, Hauno, and another Hasdrubal, 50,000. Skilful disposition, stratagem, and the Numidian cavalry, decided the bloody day in favor of the latter. Æmilius Paulus, who died the death of a hero, 21 military tribunes, 80 senators, and numberless knights, were among the 50,000, or, according to others, 70,000 Roman victims of the carnage. Only scattered remnants escaped, among them Varro, who now received the thanks of the senate, *quod de republica non desperasset*. This indomitable spirit of the Romans, as well as his own heavy loss, still prevented Hannibal from following the advice of Barca to march immediately upon Rome. He was for the present satisfied with the possession of southern Italy, and entered Capua, which opened its gates, to give rest to his troops. But the rich and luxurious metropolis of Campania proved fatal to their discipline and health, and desertion thinned their ranks. Hannibal had passed the zenith of his good fortune. Marcellus, the sword of Rome, while Fabius continued to be its shield, repulsed him from Nola, and besieged and conquered Syracuse (214-212),

a newly gained ally of Hannibal, while another ally, Philip II. of Macedon, was prevented from fulfilling his promises. Hasdrubal in Spain fought with varying success, P. Cornelius Scipio, the son, recovering what his father and uncle had lost when they fell. Sardinia and the whole of Sicily were soon in the hands of the Romans, who began to harass the coasts of Africa. While Hannibal was effecting his successful march to Tarentum and its occupation (212), other towns were lost. Capua was besieged and hard pressed. Unable to dislodge the besiegers, he suddenly marched toward Rome, and really appeared before its gates (211), but this diversion remained fruitless. The siege of Capua was not raised, and both that city and Tarentum were lost, and after a victory at Herdonea (210), Hannibal had to keep himself on the defensive in Apulia, Lucania, and Bruttium. His most dangerous enemy, Marcellus, however, fell into an ambuscade near Venusia, and was slain (208). This was one of his last achievements in Italy. His hopes rested on the approach of his brother from Spain with a mighty army; but the consuls Livius and Claudius Nero, the latter of whom secretly hastened from the south, where he was observing Hannibal, to aid his colleague in the north, destroyed in the battle on the Metaurus (207) the new army and every hope of Carthaginian success. Hannibal, into whose camp the head of his brother was thrown by the Romans, now despaired of the result, but still continued the struggle, at least for the military honor of his country, in Bruttium, the southernmost peninsula of Italy, until he was recalled in 203 to Africa, which was now invaded by Scipio, the conqueror of Spain. Immediately on his return, after so many years of absence and victories, he created a new cavalry, and defeated Masinissa of Numidia, the ally of Scipio, but tried to induce the latter to negotiate. Their interview had no result, and Hannibal was obliged to accept a battle at Zama (202), in which his large but motley army of Carthaginians, Libyans, Ligurians, Gauls, and Macedonians, succumbed to the less numerous, but well organized and disciplined host of Scipio. The terror of an eclipse of the sun, and a panic among the mercenaries, chiefly caused this terrible defeat. The second Punic war was soon over; Rome dictated cruel and humiliating terms of peace, and Carthage accepted them (201). But Hannibal's career was not yet ended. Removed from military command through the influence of the Romans, he soon rose to the highest civil dignity in his state, and as *suffete* he evinced the same energy, boldness, and genius which distinguished him as a general. He detected, denounced, and abolished inveterate abuses, reformed the judiciary, reorganized the finances, restored the resources of the republic, and concluded new alliances. But his uncompromising hostility to the embezzlers of the public revenues and monopolizers of offices increased and embittered his personal enemies, who denounced his patriotic schemes at Rome, and with a Ro-

man commission sent to Africa even concerted a plot against his life. He sought safety in flight, escaped from the city, sailed to Tyre, and thence went to the court of Antiochus the Great of Syria, whom he soon induced to declare war against the Romans, for which he was already arming. But though the king treated him with the utmost honor, he was prevented by intrigues, and a jealous anticipation of Hannibal's greater glory, from adopting his grand plans of a combined attack on Rome in Italy, as well as from giving him a proper share in the execution of his own. He was made commander of a fleet sent against the Rhodians, but failed in the expedition, though he personally distinguished himself. The Romans, having compelled Antiochus to an inglorious peace, asked the surrender of their old enemy, who was, however, informed in time to escape. He repaired to the court of Prusias, king of Bithynia, passing, it is stated, through Gortyna in Crete, where he saved his treasures, which nearly cost him his life, by placing sealed casks filled with lead under the protection of the avaricious inhabitants, while his gold lay concealed in hollow statues on the open floor of the vestibule. Anxious to induce Prusias to aid him in his plans against Rome, he is said to have gained a victory over the fleet of his enemy Eumenes of Pergamus. There, too, the Romans persecuted him; and no less a person than T. Q. Flaminius was sent to ask his surrender, and the Bithynian king was weak enough to command the arrest of his guest. But Hannibal was not unprepared, and determined to die a free enemy, and not a slave of the Romans. He took poison, and in his last hour expressed his contempt of his victorious but degraded enemies, and uttered imprecations on Prusias, their treacherous accomplice. He had kept his oath.

HANNO, a Carthaginian navigator, supposed to have flourished in the 5th century B. C. He was commissioned by the government of Carthage to explore the western coast of Africa, and to plant colonies there. Setting sail accordingly with 60 penteconters, or vessels of 50 oars each, he passed the pillars of Hercules, and voyaged along the African coast as far as lat. 8° N., according to some writers. On returning to Carthage, he caused an account of his voyage to be inscribed on a tablet, and then dedicated it in the temple of Cronos or Saturn. Of the contents of that tablet, known as a *Periplus*, we possess a translation, from which it appears that Hanno took with him a large body of colonists, and founded several cities to the N. of Cape Bojador. The geographical indications of the extent of this voyage are so vague that it is impossible to identify them. The first edition of Hanno's *Periplus* appeared at Basel in 1534, as an appendix to the edition of Arrian by Gelenius. It has also been published by Hudson in the first volume of his *Geographi Minores* (Oxford, 1698-1712); and in 1797 an English translation of it by Falconer was issued from the Oxford press.

HANNO, surnamed the Great, a Carthaginian general and statesman, contemporary with Hamilcar Barca and Hannibal, died in old age, after the battle of Zama (202 B. C.). While yet a very young man, he commanded a division of the Carthaginian army in Africa during the first Punic war, and took Hecatompylus, an opulent city of that continent. When the mercenaries returned from Sicily after the termination of the first Punic war, Hanno was deputed to propose to them that they should waive their right to a part of the arrears due them; and when they refused to accede to this proposition and took up arms to enforce their claim, he was appointed to command the army which was sent to subdue them. His military abilities were not, however, equal to the accomplishment of the enterprise, and in a little time Hamilcar, his political rival and opponent, was associated in the command with him. Hanno was afterward superseded by the suffrages of the soldiers, and a new colleague given to Hamilcar. This new general being soon after taken prisoner and killed by the mutineers, a formal reconciliation was effected between the two rivals, and Hanno was restored to his command. The fortune of war now turned against the mercenaries, who were defeated in a great battle, stripped of their strongholds, and at length completely subdued. From the termination of this war, Hanno figures rather as a politician than a warrior. He was the head of the aristocratic party at Carthage, and the great enemy of Hamilcar and his sons, whose views and policy he invariably opposed.

HANOVER, an E. co. of Va., drained by N. Anna and S. Anna rivers, which unite on its N. E. border to form the Pamunkey; area, 400 sq. m.; pop. in 1850, 15,153, of whom 8,393 were slaves. The surface is uneven, and the soil much diversified and capable of being improved. The productions in 1850 were 377,616 bushels of Indian corn, 157,388 of wheat, 94,186 of oats, 404,550 lbs. of tobacco, and 78,316 of butter. There were 24 grist mills, 2 saw mills, 3 tanneries, 2 manufactories of farming implements, 27 churches, and 345 pupils attending public schools. The Richmond and Potomac and the central railroads cross the county. Organized in 1720. Value of real estate in 1856, \$3,144,487, being an increase since 1850 of 35 per cent. Capital, Hanover Court House.

HANOVER, a township and village of Grafton co., N. H., on the E. bank of the Connecticut river, 55 m. N. W. from Concord; pop. in 1850, 2,352. The principal village is situated about $\frac{1}{2}$ m. from the river, on an elevated plain, and is built around a public square of 6 acres, on which front the principal edifices. It is the seat of Dartmouth college and medical school. (See DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.) On the other side of the river is the town of Norwich, with which it communicates by a bridge. On the south of the park are the Tontine, a brick building of 150 feet in length, and the Dartmouth hotel. There are 4 churches (1 Baptist, 2 Congre-

HEBREWS, ISRAELITES, or JEWS (Heb. *Ibrim*, *Benei Israel*, *Jehudim*), a people of Semitic race, whose ancestors appear at the very dawn of the history of mankind on the banks of the Euphrates, Jordan, and Nile, and whose fragments are now to be seen, in larger or smaller numbers, in almost all the cities of the globe, from Batavia to New Orleans, from Stockholm to Cape Town. This people, as such, forms one of the most remarkable phenomena in history. When little more numerous than a family, they had their language, customs, and peculiar observances, treated with princees, and in every respect acted as a nation. Though broken as if into atoms and scattered through all climes, among the rudest and the most civilized nations, they have preserved through thousands of years common features, habits, and observances, a common religion, literature, and sacred language. Without any political union, without a common head or centre, they are generally regarded and regard themselves, as a nation. They began as nomads "migrating from nation to nation, from state to state;" their law made them agriculturists for 15 centuries; their exile has transformed them into a mercantile people. They have struggled for their national existence against the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Syrians, and Romans; have been conquered and nearly exterminated by each of these powers, and have survived them all. They have been oppressed and persecuted by emperors and republics, sultans and popes, Moors and inquisitors; they were proscribed in Catholic Spain, Protestant Norway, and Greek Muscovy, while their persecutors sang the hymns of their psalmists, revered their books, believed in their prophets, and even persecuted them in the name of their God. They have numbered philosophers among the Greeks of Alexandria and the Saracens of Cordova, have transplanted the wisdom of the East beyond the Pyrénées and the Rhine, and have been treated as pariahs among pagans, Mohammedans, and Christians. They have fought for liberty under Kosciuszko and Blücher, and popular assemblies among the Slavi and Germans still withheld from them the right of living in certain towns, villages, and streets. This phenomenon, however, admits of explanation. At the very beginning they were not merely a family or tribe, but also a sect, a society or community, superior to those surrounding it in culture, morals, and ideals, too powerless to hope for great success over others, but anxious to defend their own moral condition at the price of self-isolation, and to perpetuate it by the development of peculiar customs and religious observances. The father of the people himself, Abraham, is recorded as acting under a divine mission, and leaving the land of his parents and his birth in order to preserve and propagate his ideal in "his children and house." After a hard trial in Egypt and a marvellous deliverance they received a law, at the same time national and religious, which constituted them a

"people of priests" to enlighten the nations by their example, and which by its sublimity inspired them with the natural conviction that they were the chosen people of God, who alone knew him and walked in his ways. The national and religious elements became more and more developed and blended, the antagonism with the surrounding idolatry and religiously instituted immorality more and more striking; a long continued struggle for self-preservation against overwhelming influences changed enthusiasm into fanaticism and self-esteem into repulsive pride, which was repaid by antipathy, hatred, and cruel persecution. Their national independence was destroyed; fanatical attempts to recover it failed; they were scattered among nations who in the meanwhile had reached a civilization in some respects superior to their own; the ancient idolatries were replaced by new religious systems drawn from Hebrew sources; the name of their God was now praised from the rising of the sun to its setting; the ruins of their Zion had become sacred to the nations. But still they clung to their faith, ceremonies, traditions, and hopes; for their religious and national characteristics were so deeply rooted and so well blended that they wonderfully supported each other. They were still convinced of their religious and moral superiority to the Gentiles; they were justified by the cruelties of the world in believing themselves its martyrs; they submitted to them from what they regarded as a divine obligation. Their masters punished their self-sufficiency, humiliating pride, and pretensions by crushing burdens and legal degradation, their religious enemies by calumnies, the people by contemptuous social exclusion; and it was not till the last quarter of the 18th century that a brighter prospect opened by the inauguration of the principle of religious liberty and civil equality in America and afterward in the N. W. of Europe. This all-pervading mixture of the religious and national elements also requires a different treatment of their history from that of all other nations. It must be at once a history of the people, of its religion, and of its literature. Separate from it the religious leaders Moses, Ezra, Hillel, Rabbi Gamaliel, &c., and no national history remains. The prose writings of the Pentateuch, the effusions of Isaiah or Micah, the Psalms, the Lamentations, the Hebrew writings of Maimonides or Mendelssohn, can as little be separated, as merely literary works, from the history of the people, as can the Philippic of Demosthenes from that of Athens, Cicero's orations against Catiline from that of Rome, or the declaration of independence from that of the United States. Having thus stated the character of our subject and the only natural way of treating it, we must also refer the readers of this brief sketch for further details, criticism, and illustrations, to the respective special articles of this work, as well as to the "book of books" itself, which is in the hands of each of them.—The history of the Hebrews begins (about 2000

B. C., according to the generally adopted chronology) with the emigration of the Semite Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees (*Ur Casdim*), a place which has been identified with a fortress of the same name in Mesopotamia mentioned by Ammianus, and by more recent critics (Rawlinson and others) with Hur or Mugheir in the vicinity of Babylon. He was by his father Terah a descendant of Eber, and may as such have borne the name Ibri (Hebrew), but more likely he was first designated by it in the land west of the Euphrates, as an immigrant from beyond (*eber*) the "great river." The name Israelite was applied to his descendants after a surname of Jacob, his grandson, and that of Jehudim (Jews) at a much later period (first mentioned about 712 B. C.), when, after the dispersion of the 10 tribes, the house of Judah became the representative of the whole people. Separating from his relatives, who were idolaters, Abraham passed over from Mesopotamia (Aram Naharaim) to Canaan or Palestine (as it was afterward called by the Greeks after the Philistines, who inhabited its S. W. coast), where he lived the life of a nomad, being rich in herds, flocks, and attendants, and worshipping the "Creator of heaven and earth," to whose service, "to walk before him and to be innocent," he bound himself and his house, in after life, by the covenant of circumcision. Having repaired to Egypt during a famine and returned, he rescued his nephew Lot, who lived in the valley of the lower Jordan, from the captivity of Amraphel, a king of Shinar, and his allies; lived for some time in the land of the Philistines; and finally settled near Hebron, where he died, leaving his main inheritance and his faith to Isaac, his son by his relative Sarah. Isaac thus became the second Hebrew patriarch, while his brother Ishmael, the son of Hagar, an Egyptian woman, sought a separate abode in Arabia, where he became the father of a Bedouin tribe. Of the two sons of Isaac, only Jacob (afterward Israel), the favorite of their mother Rebecca, imitated the peaceful and pious life of his fathers and propagated the Hebrew line in Palestine, while his brother Esau (or Edom) settled in the mountainous land of Seir (Idumæa). Jacob had 12 sons, of whom he distinguished Joseph, the child of his favorite wife Rachel. This excited the envy of the others, who secretly sold their brother as a slave to Egypt, where he rose through his wisdom to the dignity of prime minister to one of the Pharaohs. The latter allowed him to bring the whole family of his father, numbering 70 males, over from the land of Canaan, and to settle them in the province of Goshen (E. of the Pelusiatic branch of the Nile, it is supposed), where they could continue their pastoral life, unmolested by the Egyptians, who held that mode of existence in great contempt, and where they would be uncontaminated by Egyptian idolatry. Jacob closed his life, which had been shorter and less happy than that of his fathers, after having adopted the two sons of Joseph, Manasseh and Ephraim, for his

own, and blessed all his children. The book of Genesis, the only record of that earliest period of Hebrew history, closing with the death of Jacob and Joseph, also contains the last blessing of the former, a sublime vision in which love and just censure are mingled, and a specimen of the most ancient Hebrew poetry. After the death of Joseph the Hebrews were not only oppressed but degraded to the condition of slaves, were overtaken and employed in the public works, while the fear of their joining a foreign enemy finally led one of their tyrants to decree what may be called their slow extermination, they having in the meanwhile increased to a prodigious number. How long they remained in the "house of slaves" (for the Hebrews were not the only slaves in Egypt) cannot be determined, there being scriptural testimony for 430, as well as for about 210 years; nor can the precise date of their arrival, which Bunsen endeavors to fix almost 1,000 years earlier than it is fixed by scriptural chronology; nor of their exodus, which, according to some of the most celebrated Egyptological critics, Wilkinson, Bunsen, Lepsius, &c., took place in the last quarter of the 14th century B. C., while according to a distinct biblical passage (1 Kings, vi. 1) it must have happened early in the 15th. Nor is it easier or more important to find the reigns during which these events took place. There is no conclusive evidence to identify either Phthahmen, Menephtah, or Rhamses I. or II., with the Pharaoh of the exodus, as various critical defenders of a later date have tried to do. Others have attempted to identify the Hebrews with the Hyksos, which is little less absurd than the fables of Manetho mentioned by Josephus. The last named Jewish historian has also some traditional additions to the early life of Moses, concerning his exploits in Ethiopia, which may still find confirmation in future Egyptological discoveries. Omitting all special criticism, we must confine our narrative here to a brief extract from the sacred and therefore well guarded record of the nation itself; and as there is no other beside it, even criticism can do little more. Born at the time when the oppression of his people had been carried to its extreme, Moses, the younger son of Amram, a descendant of Levi, the 3d son of Jacob, was doomed to perish in the Nile like all new-born males of the Israelites, but was saved by the love of his mother Jochebed and his sister Miriam, and the compassion of a daughter of the Pharaoh. Adopted as a son by the princess, who gave him his name (Egyptian, *mo-* water, and *yzes*, drawn; Hebrew, *mashoh*, to draw) in allusion to her having drawn him out of the water, but nursed by his mother, he united the highest Egyptian education with the feelings of a Hebrew. And "when Moses was grown he went out unto his brethren, and looked on their burdens." Seeing an Egyptian man smiting one of his brethren, he killed him, fled to Midian, married Zipporah, the daughter of Jethro, a wise priest or prince of that country,

by whom he had two sons, and tended the flock of his father-in-law, leading it into the desert, as far as Mount Horeb; the N. E. eminence of Mount Sinai, in the S. part of the Arabian peninsula between the two gulfs of the Red sea. It was not till the decline of his life that he returned to Egypt to become the "shepherd of his people." He appeared with his brother Aaron, his spokesman, assembled the elders of Israel, and announced to them their approaching deliverance and return to Canaan in the name of the Everlasting (Hebrew, *Jehovah*, Being) and Unchangeable (*Ehyeh-asher-ehyeh*, I-am-that-I-am), the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who "had seen their affliction." He now repaired to the palace of the king, proved superior to his priests, gained the admiration of his ministers and people (Exod. xi. 3), threatened, and finally compelled him to grant his demand by a series of disasters, the last of which was the sudden destruction at midnight of all the first born Egyptians (probably then a mighty aristocracy). The Israelites had received their secret instructions, and immediately departed toward the desert. Moses led them across the northern extremity of the gulf of Akabah or Suez, the western prolongation of the Red sea (Heb. *Yam Soaf*, reedy sea); and the king of Egypt, who, repenting of having let them go, pursued them with his cavalry and heavy war chariots, perished there with his army. The "song of Moses," which celebrates this great event (Exod. xv.), is another admirable monument of ancient Hebrew poetry, though surpassed in grandeur by that which closes the narrative of his life (Deut. xxxii.). After having repulsed an attack of the Amalekites, a roving and predatory Arabian tribe, Moses led the people to Mount Sinai, which from the delivery of the ten commandments now received the name of the mountain of God. This divine decalogue not only contained the common fundamental points of every moral and legal code ("Honor thy father and mother," "Thou shalt not murder," &c.), but also included the sublime truth of monotheism, the great social institution of the sabbath, and the lofty moral precept: "Thou shalt not covet." These commandments, which formed the basis of a "covenant between God and Israel," together with the successively promulgated statutes, precepts, &c. (according to the rabbis altogether 365 positive and 248 negative obligations), constitute the Mosaic law (*Torath Mosheh*), which is contained principally in the 2d and 3d, and repeated in the 5th book of the Pentateuch, and which for about 15 centuries remained, and with the exception of a strictly national part still is, the general code of the Hebrews. Its aims are the moral perfection of the individual and the welfare of society. Its means are chiefly a common and central worship, under the direction of the Aaronites (*Cohenim*), whose restrictive obligations are, however, not equalled by the privileges they enjoy; 3 festivals for the commemoration of great national events, thanksgiving and rejoicing, as well as for the

annual gathering of the whole people; a fast day for repentance; periodical readings of the law; general education through the Levites its guardians (Deut. xxxiii. 10); a weekly day of rest (sabbath) for the people and their animals; the 7th year as a periodical time of rest for the earth, as well as for the extinction of various pecuniary claims; numerous and most frequently repeated obligations for the support of the fatherless and widow, the poor and the stranger; an organized judiciary and police; a severe penal code; strict rules for the preservation of health and cleanliness; circumcision as a bodily mark of the covenant; and numerous other rites and ceremonies designed to guard the nationality, or to lead to the preservation of truths and principles (which has been admirably illustrated in Mendelssohn's "Jerusalem"). The spirit of the whole was well defined by Rabbi Hillel in his words to a heathen who desired to be instructed in Judaism in a few minutes: "'Do not to others what you would not have others do to you' is the essence; every thing else is but comment." The chief principles are: self-sanctification and righteousness, in imitation of God, who is holy and righteous (Lev. xix. 2, &c.); brotherly love and equality, for all people are his children (Deut. xiv. i.); freedom, for all are bound exclusively to his service (Lev. xxv. 55); limited right of property, for the whole land belongs to him (Lev. xxv. 23). The principal promise of reward is the natural share of the individual in the happiness of society; the principal threat of celestial punishment, his natural share in its misfortunes; every mention of reward beyond the grave, which in the time of Moses had long been a chief element in the teachings of Egyptian and other priests, is avoided throughout, probably as promoting selfishness in a rude state of society by referring exclusively to the individual. The form of government is the republican (though a limited monarchy may be established if the people demand it), with the moral theocratic dictatorship of a prophet (*nabi*) like the lawgiver, with the sovereignty of the people who judge the merits and claims of the prophet above it, and above all the majesty of the divine law, which can be explained and developed, but not altered. The whole system is entirely practical, containing no definitions of supernatural things, except in a negative form, no articles of belief, no formulas of prayer. The following extracts from one chapter (Lev. xix.) of the Pentateuch may serve as an illustration of its general character: "Ye shall fear every man his mother and his father, and keep my sabbaths: I am the Lord your God. . . . And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and the stranger: I am the Lord your God. Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither

lie one to another. And ye shall not swear by my name falsely, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I am the Lord. Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbor, neither rob him; the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning. . . . Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor. Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people; neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbor: I am the Lord. Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him. Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am the Lord. . . . Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards, to be defiled by them: I am the Lord your God. Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of the old man, and fear thy God: I am the Lord. And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God. Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in mete-yard, in weight, or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just *ephah*, and a just *hin* shall ye have: I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them: I am the Lord."—But the difficulties of introducing this system of institutions were as immense as those of maintaining the nation in the desert. The first census showed 22 male Levites above one year of age, and 603,550 males of other tribes above 20, including 22,273 first born. Provisions were scanty, water was scarce, dangers were constant; the people were an unruly mass of freed slaves, who often regretfully thought of the flesh pots of Egypt and of the quiet carelessness of bondage; a multitude of non-Israelites who had joined them regretted the visible gods of their former worship; envy and ambition often augmented the existing dissatisfaction. Moses was still on Mount Sinai when the people compelled his brother Aaron to give them, in a golden calf, an imitation of the Egyptian Apis, a visible god. Moses, descending, broke the tablets of the covenant in his anger, and restored order by a massacre of the idolatrous rioters, but almost despaired of his mission and desired to die. A pompous worship was now introduced, and sacrifices ordained, of which a later prophet, Jeremiah (vii. 22), significantly says in the name of God: "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices." Moses removed his tent from the camp. All difficulties, however, were con-

quered by the "man of God," who consoled himself with the idea that a generation educated under his guidance would replace that of the desert. Having passed round the lands of the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites, he conquered those of Sihon, king of the Amorites, and of Og, king of Bashan (Batanæa), E. of the Jordan, giving them to the tribes of Reuben and Gad and to half the tribe of Manasseh, and died on Mount Nebo before entering the land of promise. The man who was "meek above all men that were on the face of the earth" died in voluntary loneliness, and "no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." Joshua, his pupil and appointed successor, an Ephraimite, now led the 13 tribes of Israel, named after 11 sons of Jacob and the 2 sons of Joseph, across the Jordan into Canaan (or Palestine proper), which was conquered after a bloody war of extermination, and allotted to the tribes of Judah, Ephraim, Manasseh (the other half), Benjamin, Simeon, Zebulun, Issachar, Asher, Naphtali, and Dan. The Levites, who were to live by tithes, received no separate division, but a number of cities within the limits of every tribe, among others the historical places of Gibeon, Geba, Beth-Horon, Mahanaim, Hesbon, Jazer, Hebron, Shechem, Golan, Kedesh, and Ramoth-Gilead; of which the last 5 together with Bezer were selected as towns of refuge for involuntary murderers, while Shiloh became the central city, receiving the tabernacle with the ark of the covenant. Phinehas, son of Eleazar, the zealous priest, and Caleb, son of Jephunneh, were among the most distinguished assistants of Joshua. Before his death, Joshua held an assembly of the whole nation at Shechem, in which he called upon them to choose once more between the gods of their ancestors beyond the Euphrates, those of the conquered Amorites, and the God whom he was determined to follow with his house. The people chose their Deliverer and Preserver, and confirmed their choice by a new covenant; but scarcely were the elders gone who had witnessed the whole work of deliverance and maintained the order of Joshua, when idolatry and anarchy became general. Parts of the country remained unconquered, principally in the hands of the Phœnicians in the N. W., of the Philistines in the S. W., and of the Jebusites in the centre. With these, and with other neighbors on the borders, frequent warfare had to be waged, while the young state, forming a loose confederacy of 12 (or, counting Manasseh as two, of 13) almost independent members, had neither natural boundaries nor a capital, neither a hereditary head nor an elective federal government, the only bond of union being the common law, and the only centre the seat of the ark of the covenant, whose guardians probably enjoyed the privilege of convoking a general assembly of the people in cases of urgent necessity. Such national assemblies were often held at Mizpah. But the enmity and frequent attacks of the surrounding idolatrous tribes was less pernicious than their

friendly relations in times of peace, when the voluptuous rites connected with the worship of Ashtoreth and other divinities of the Phœnicians, Syrians, and Philistines, were too seductive for a people in an undeveloped state, whose own religion required a rigid observance of a strict morality. To remedy these evils, heroic and inspired men arose from time to time, repulsed the enemies, restored order and the law, were acknowledged as leaders and judges, at least by a part of the people, and thus revived its unity. This period of republican federalism under judges (*shofetim*, a name which also designated the chief magistrates of the Carthaginians in their language, which was also Semitic) is described in the book of that name, a continuation of that of Joshua, and forms one of the most interesting portions of Hebrew history. But criticism labors in vain to arrange chronologically the striking but in part probably contemporaneous events of the narrative. Othniel, a younger brother or nephew of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah, was the first of the judges. Ehud, a Benjamite, delivered Israel from the oppression of the Moabites, having killed with his own left hand Eglon, the king of the invaders. "And after him was Shamgar, the son of Anath, who slew of the Philistines 600 men with an ox goad," at a time when "no shield was seen or a spear among 40,000 in Israel." Barak, a Naphtalite, inspired by Deborah, a female prophet and judge, who afterward celebrated the event in her great song (Judges v.), gained together with her a signal victory near Mount Tabor and the brook Kishon over the army of Sisera, commander of Jabin, a Canaanite king on the N. of Palestine, which numbered 900 iron war chariots. Sisera fled, but was killed in sleep by Jael, a woman of the nomadic and neutral Kenite tribe, in whose tent he had sought refuge. "The mother of Sisera looked out at a window, and cried through the lattice, Why is his chariot so long in coming? why tarry the wheels of his chariot? Her wise ladies answered her, yea, she returned answer to herself, Have they not sped, have they not divided the prey?" The song closes by comparing the victorious friends of the Lord to the rising sun conquering the night. Gideon, characterized as the youngest son of one of the weakest families in Manasseh, surprised with 300 select men the immense camp of the Midianites and Amalekites, dispersed them, called the surrounding tribes to arms, exterminated the invaders, appeased the Ephraimites, who were jealous of the glory gained by their neighbors, and refused to accept the royal dignity offered him by the gratitude of the people, declaring: "I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you; the Lord shall rule over you." Abimelech, however, his son by a concubine, gained adherents among the idolatrous friends of his mother in Shechem, destroyed the numerous family of his father, was proclaimed king in that city, was afterward expelled, but reconquered the city, and finally

perished while besieging the tower of the neighboring Thebez by a piece of millstone cast from its top by a woman. Jotham, the only son of Jerubbaal (as Gideon was called from his destruction of the Baal worship) who escaped from the massacre of his brothers, had predicted the bloody end of the usurper in his fable of "the trees that went forth to anoint a king over them" (Judges ix.), which is probably the most ancient specimen of that kind of poetry now extant. Of the judges Tola, of the tribe of Issachar, and Jair from Gilead in Manasseh beyond the Jordan, little more is preserved than their names. Jephthah, another Gileadite, of illegitimate birth, having been expelled from his home, was recalled by his native district to combat against the Ammonites, who had attacked it, carried the war into the land of the enemy, and returned after a signal victory, of which his heroic daughter, in consequence of a vow, became a victim, being doomed to die or to live unmarried in loneliness, the obscurity of the narrative rendering this point uncertain. And "the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in a year." The Ephraimites, who had not been called to participate in the combat, now threatened vengeance on the conqueror, who, unlike Gideon, terminated the quarrel with a bloody defeat of the troublesome tribe, which is the first example of civil war among the Israelites, soon to be followed by others. Ibzan of Bethlehem in Judah, Elon, a Zebulunite, and Abdon, an Ephraimite, are next briefly mentioned as judges. Dan, too, gave Israel a judge in the person of Samson, who braved and humiliated the Philistines; he was a Nazarite of prodigious strength, whose adventurous exploits in life and death greatly resemble those of the legendary heroes of Greece. The greatest anarchy now prevailed. The Danites not having yet conquered their territory, 600 men among them made an independent expedition north, and conquered a peaceful town of the Phœnicians, Laish, which was by them named Dan, and is henceforth mentioned as the northernmost town of the whole country, the opposite southern point being Beersheba. The concubine of a Levite having been outraged to death on a passage through Gibeah in Benjamin by some inhabitants of that place, her husband cut her corpse into pieces and sent them to all the tribes, calling for vengeance. The people assembled at Mizpah, and demanded from Benjamin the surrender of the criminals. The Benjamites refused to obey what they probably regarded as a usurpation by the confederacy of their sovereign rights, and a bloody civil war ensued, in which they were nearly exterminated after a heroic struggle against overwhelming forces. The people wept over their fratricidal victory, and 600 Benjamites who alone survived were allowed to seize wives (for the victors had sworn not to give them any) from among the girls dancing in the valley of Shiloh, on a sacred festival annually celebrated there. The

little book of Ruth, which contains the idyllic narrative of the Moabitish widow of that name, who, faithfully sharing the fate of her unfortunate mother-in-law, adopted her Hebrew home and religion, and married Boaz, is supplementary to the book of Judges. The 1st book of Samuel begins with the continuation of the latter. The priest Eli, who died suddenly on receiving the news of the defeat of his people by the Philistines, the death of his two sons, and the capture of the ark of the covenant, and his pupil, the prophet or seer Samuel, the son of Elkanah and the pious Hannah, were the last of the judges. The latter reestablished the exclusive worship of the Lord, routed the Philistines, restored the ark, and introduced schools of prophets, residing in Ramah, his native place, and regularly visiting Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah; and when he finally resigned the executive power, he could say to the assembled people at Gilgal: "Behold, here I am; witness against me before the Lord: Whose ox have I taken? or whose ass have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? whom have I oppressed? or of whose hand have I received any bribe to blind mine eyes therewith?" And the people testified to the purity of his career. But his sons, whom he appointed in his old age, acted very differently, and their corruption, but still more the desire for a strong military head, so natural after the previous long period of war, anarchy, and disunion, finally decided the people to urge the appointment of a king to rule them "like all other nations." The seer, deeply grieved by the proposed change of the Mosaic form of government, which is distinctly branded in the narrative as a repudiation of the divine rule itself, in vain painted to the people all the oppression, extortion, and degradation inseparable from monarchical rule (1 Sam. viii.); they persisted in their demand, and he was obliged to yield. Saul, the son of Kish, was appointed the first king of Israel, and the constitution of the monarchy (1 Sam. x. 25) was written and deposited in the sanctuary. The new rule was strengthened and became popular by a series of victories over the Ammonites, Moabites, Idumæans, Syrians, and Philistines. The eldest son of the king, Jonathan, distinguished himself as a heroic youth. Abner, a cousin of Saul, became commander of the army. Gibeah was the capital of the new monarchy. But an expedition against the Amalekites, though successful, was not executed according to the ordinance of Samuel, who now turned his influence against Saul. The spirit of the latter became troubled, and David, the son of Jesse of Bethlehem, was brought to soothe his temper with music. This young shepherd excited the jealousy of Saul by his triumph over Goliath, the Philistine giant, which decided a campaign, as well as by his subsequent successes when he married the princess Michal, and became the intimate friend of her brother Jonathan. Foreseeing the future destinies of the aspiring youth, Saul repeatedly attempted to take his life, and, exasperated by his failures,

and the protection bestowed on David by his children, Samuel, and the priests, he exterminated the inhabitants of Nob, a city of the latter, and passed his life in pursuit of his rival, who, with a band of desperate outlaws roving on the southern borders of the country, baffled every attempt to capture him. The extermination of wizardship was one of the acts of Saul. His reign was terminated by a catastrophe. A battle was fought against the Philistines at Mount Gilboa; the Hebrews fled, Jonathan and two other sons of Saul fell, and the king slew himself with his own sword. David, whose skill in poetry equalled his musical genius, honored in a touching elegy the memory of his fallen friend and foe (2 Sam. i.), who, "lovely and pleasant in their lives, were even in their death not divided: they were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions." Repairing to Hebron, he was anointed there by his own tribe of Judah as king, while Abner proclaimed a surviving son of Saul, Ishbosheth, at Mahanaim, who was acknowledged by all the other tribes (about 1055 B. C.). Bloody conflicts stained this double reign, David continually gaining the ascendancy through his heroic officers, the brothers Joab, Abisai, and Asahel, until the assassination of Abner and soon after of Ishbosheth, caused by private revenge, gave him the whole kingdom. He now conquered Zion from the Jebusites, made Jerusalem his capital, organized the national worship as well as the military power of the state, and by continual victories over all surrounding neighbors, except Phœnicia, a friendly country, extended the limits of his dominions N. E. as far as the Euphrates, and S. W. as far as the Red sea. Justice was strictly administered; literature and arts, especially poetry and music, flourished. Asaph, the founder of a family of sacred singers, rivalled the king in psalms; Nathan and Gad assisted him as prophets, Zadok and Abiathar as priests; Joab held almost continually the chief command of the army. But the palace of the king was often stained with crimes; David himself had much to repent of; the infamous deeds of his sons by various wives, Amnon, Absalom, and Adonijah, distracted the peace of his house and kingdom, and the two former had perished, and two great insurrections had been quelled, when he died after a reign of 40 years (about 1015). His son and successor Solomon, by Bathsheba, the widow of the assassinated patriot Uriah, a youth of 12 years, commenced his reign with the execution of his half brother Adonijah and the aged Joab, who had conspired against his succession; but he soon became famous for personal wisdom and scientific attainments, as well as for the splendor of his court and the prosperity of his subjects. He inherited a large army and a full treasury, but he used the former only to preserve peace and secure tribute from his neighbors, and the latter for the adornment of his country by numerous gorgeous public structures. He built the temple, which more than

all contributed to his glory, a royal palace, both in Jerusalem and with the assistance of Tyrian architects, an armory, Palmyra (Tadmor) in the desert, and other cities; made common naval expeditions with the king of Tyre, from Ezion Geber, a port on the eastern gulf of the Red sea, to the distant land of Ophir, which brought back gold, gems, precious woods, and rare animals; imported horses from Egypt for his numerous cavalry and war chariots; and introduced general luxury and culture by his example. The fame of his wisdom attracted visitors from many nations, among others the queen of Sheba (Sabæa) in southern Arabia. The authorship of 3,000 proverbs and 1,005 songs is mentioned among his literary merits; for he wrote on beasts, fowls, creeping animals, fishes, and on all kinds of plants from the cedar in Lebanon to the hyssop on the wall; and the extant philosophical book of Proverbs and the graceful Song of Songs bear his name. But, on the other hand, while the mighty monarch was teaching wisdom in admired works of literature, his personal example taught extravagance and folly. His court was as corrupt as it was splendid. The magnificence which he exhibited was not exclusively the product of foreign gold, tribute, and presents, but in part based on the taxes of his subjects. The army served not only to secure peace, but also as a tool of oppression. The public structures were built with the sweat of the people. Near the national temple on Mount Moriah, altars and mounds were erected for the worship of Ashtoreth, Moloch, and other idols, introduced by some of his numberless wives from their native countries, Phœnicia, the land of Ammon, Idumæa, and Egypt. Rezon was suffered to establish a hostile dynasty in Damascus, and Hadad to make himself independent in Idumæa. When Solomon died, after a peaceful reign of 40 years, the people felt themselves so exhausted that they demanded a considerable change from his son Rehoboam before they proclaimed him king at Shechem, where they had assembled for the purpose. Jeroboam, an Ephraimite who had already attempted an insurrection against the late king, now returned from his exile in Egypt and headed a deputation of the most distinguished citizens. Rehoboam promised an answer after 3 days. The experienced councillors of his father advised him to yield for the moment in order to be master for life; but the advice of his younger companions better suited his disposition, and his reply to the people was accordingly: "My father made your yoke heavy, and I will add to your yoke; my father also chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." The consequence of this was an immediate defection of 10 tribes, who proclaimed Jeroboam their king, while only Judah and Benjamin remained faithful to the house of David. Rehoboam, having fled from Shechem, where his receiver-general of taxes was stoned by the revolted people, returned to Jerusalem and assembled a powerful army to reconquer his lost dominions; but the prophet

Shemaiah dissuaded the people in the name of God from the civil war. Thus the division of the state into two separate kingdoms was consummated (975). The northern, comprising the country N. of Benjamin and all E. of the Jordan, was called Israel, or, from its principal members, Ephraim and Manasseh, the house of Joseph, and poetically Ephraim; its capital was Shechem, subsequently Tirzah, and finally Samaria (Shomron). The southern, from its chief tribe called Judah, had the advantage of possessing the sanctuary in the old capital, and being supported by the Levites and the priests, who gathered around it. To destroy the influence of the religious element upon his own subjects, who according to the Mosaic law were bound to repair 3 times in the year to the chosen sacred spot, Jeroboam revived the not yet extinct Egyptian superstitions of his people, established two golden calves as emblems of their divinity, at Dan and Bethel, on the N. and S. boundaries of his state, admitted non-Levites to the priestly office, and introduced new festivals and even a new calendar. The Mosaic institutions being thus systematically excluded from the state, idolatry, despotism, and corruption prevailed throughout the 250 years of its existence, almost without interruption. While these evils remained permanent, the condition of the people was made still worse by a continual change of masters. Usurpation followed usurpation; conspiracy, revolt, and regicide became common events. The house of Jeroboam was exterminated with his son Nadab by Baasha, who reigned at Tirzah, and whose son Elah was assassinated while drunk by Zimri, one of his generals. At the same time another of his officers, who commanded an army besieging Gibbethon, a city of the Philistines, was proclaimed king by his troops, marched upon Tirzah, and took it, and Zimri after a reign of 7 days burned himself with his palace. A part of the people now wanted Tibni, but Omri prevailed, and Tibni died. Omri, who built Samaria and made it his capital, was succeeded by his son Ahab, whose wife Jezebel, a Sidonian princess, was fanatically zealous in propagating the worship of the Phœnician Baal, and in persecuting the prophets of monotheism, who were almost exterminated. Ahab having died of a wound received in the battle of Ramoth-Gilead against the Syrians under Benhadad II. (897), his two sons Ahaziah and Jehoram successively reigned after him; but with the latter the idolatrous house of Omri was exterminated by Jehu, who was proclaimed king by the officers of the army which he commanded against Hazael of Syria in Gilead (884). Jehu, who had been anointed by the prophet Elisha, abolished the worship of Baal, but left the institutions of Jeroboam. His dynasty, assisted by the influence of Elisha, was in many respects prosperous. To it belonged the kings Jehoahaz, Joash, Jeroboam II., and Zechariah, with whose murder by Shallum it ended (773). Shallum met with the same fate after a month through Menahem,

whose son Pekahiah was slain and succeeded by his chariot driver Pekah. The murderer of the latter, Hoshea, was the last of the usurpers, and the last king of Israel. This state, which during all its existence was exposed to violent shocks from its neighbors, Judah, the Philistines, Moab, which revolted, and especially from the Syrians of Damascus, against whom its possessions beyond the Jordan could seldom be defended, had recovered some strength by repeated victories under Joash and Jeroboam II.; but soon after, rotten and decayed through idolatry, despotism, and anarchy, it became an easy prey to the growing power of Assyria, to whose king Phul it became tributary after an invasion in the reign of Menahem. Tiglath Pileser conquered its E. and N. provinces, carrying off the inhabitants to Assyria, in the time of Pekah, and Salmanassar destroyed it entirely, conquering the capital, Samaria, after a siege of 3 years (721), taking Hoshea prisoner, and dispersing the inhabitants throughout the N. E. provinces of his empire, where their idolatrous habits made them likely to lose their nationality and soon to disappear among their neighbors, though scattered remnants may occasionally have emerged at later periods, and in various countries, as representatives of the 10 tribes of Israel. The prophets Ahijah of Shiloh, who contributed to the election of Jeroboam I., Elijah, the hero of the Mosaic religion under Ahab, his great disciple Elisha, the two contemporaries of Jeroboam II., Amos and Hosea, Micah, who lived in the last period, and many others, strove in vain to check the growing power of evil by appeals to the conscience of rulers and people, boldly denouncing the despotism, hypocrisy, and licentiousness of kings, princes, and priests, the selfishness, pride, and extravagance of the rich, the extortions, deceptions, and seductions practised on the people, and again and again kindling the spirit of justice, truth, patriotism, humility, or hope. The extant books of the three last named prophets, while painting in the darkest colors the wickedness and perverseness of the mighty and the degradation and misery of the poor, console us by showing what pure and sublime ideas of justice, morality, and fraternity were still entertained and taught, what bright visions of a future state of mankind could still be conceived, and what severe truths and fiery reprimands were still listened to even in those times. Without these living thoughts of that distant age, without these evidences of continued moral struggles and sublime efforts, the history of the kingdom of Israel, as preserved in the books of Kings and Chronicles, would be but a gloomy record of crime, bloodshed, and misery.—The rival state of Judah enjoyed more frequent periods of prosperity and lawful order, as well as a longer duration. There the interest of the dynasty, which continued in a direct line of succession down to the latest period, was identical with that of the people. Their common enemy was the idolatry which reigned in Israel. Their common

safeguard was the law, which was here supported by the Levites, and more effectively defended by the prophets. Corruption, however, often led both government and people to break down their only wall of protection, and to imitate the pernicious example of their neighbors. This tendency prevailed as early as the reign of Rehoboam, the most important event of which was the invasion of Shishak (Sheshonk), king of Egypt, who pillaged the temple and the royal palace. War against Jeroboam was almost continually waged during this and the following short reign of Abijam. The successor of the latter, Asa, abolished idolatry, checked public immorality, routed an invading army of Ethiopians, resisted the attacks of Baasha of Israel through an alliance with the king of Damascene Syria, and fortified Gibeah and Mizpah against an invasion from the north. Jehoshaphat, his son, made peace with Israel, and even fought in alliance with Ahab against Benhadad of Syria (897), subdued Idumæa, and fought successfully against the Moabites and their allies, but was unfortunate in an attempted expedition to Ophir. Internally, too, his reign was one of the most successful, the salutary reforms of his father being further developed. But his son Jehoram, having married Athaliah, a sister of Ahab, followed the example of the court of Samaria, and also lost his father's conquest, Idumæa, by a revolt. Ahaziah was equally attached to the house of Ahab, whose fate he shared. Having gone to visit Jehoram, he was mortally wounded by the conspirators under Jehu, and expired on his flight at Megiddo (884). On receiving news of that event, Athaliah his mother usurped the government, exterminating all the royal princes except one, Joash, a child of one year, who was saved by his aunt and secreted in the temple. Six years later Jehoiada, an old priest, matured a conspiracy, the legal heir to the house of David was produced in the temple, and the queen, who hastened thither, was slain. The altars of Baal were now destroyed, and the temple repaired under the influence of Jehoiada; but an invasion of Hazael from Syria could not be repulsed, and the capital itself was saved only by an immense ransom. After the death of Jehoiada Joash abandoned his teachings, and even the son of his benefactor, Zechariah, who boldly reprimanded him, fell a victim to his tyranny, which was ended with his life by a conspiracy (838). His successor Amaziah punished the murderers of his father, and made a successful expedition to Idumæa, but was made prisoner in a battle against Joash, king of Israel, which he had wantonly provoked by a challenge, and, having returned after the death of that king to his conquered and unfortified capital, was deprived by a conspiracy of his throne and life. The following reign of Uzziah or Azariah was not only one of the longest in the history of the Hebrews, lasting 52 years, but also distinguished by victories over the Philistines, Arabians, and Ammonites, and by the flourishing condition

of husbandry, mechanical arts, and literature. Beside Amos and Hosea, who were active also in Judah, Jonah and Joel were among the prophets of that period. Of the last we still possess a beautiful poetical description of a dreadful devastation by locusts, perhaps allegorically of barbarians, when "the land was as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness." Another destructive event was a long remembered earthquake. Jotham, the son of Uzziah, who during the last years of his reign acted as regent, continued after his father's death (759) his beneficent rule; but his son Ahaz again introduced idolatry, and his reign was disgraceful and disastrous. Rezin and Pekah, allied against him, advanced as far as Jerusalem, which was saved only by the dearly purchased aid of Tiglath Pileser, king of Assyria, who conquered Damascus, carried its inhabitants into captivity, and slew Rezin. Ahaz declared himself the subject of his Assyrian deliverer, and also suffered attacks by the revolted Philistines, while the state of the interior of the country provoked the immortal denunciations of Isaiah and Micah. "How is the faithful city become a harlot!" exclaims the former of Jerusalem. "It was full of judgment; righteousness lodged in it; but now murderers. Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water; thy princes are rebellious, and companions of thieves; every one loveth gifts, and followeth after rewards; they judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come unto them." The latter thus addresses the rulers; "Hear this, I pray you, ye heads of the house of Jacob, and ye princes of the house of Israel, that abhor judgment, and pervert all equity. They build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money." But these prophets express in no less glowing words their hopes of a better future, which seemed to be realized in the succeeding reign of Hezekiah the son of Ahaz. This pious king followed almost entirely the injunctions of Isaiah, who was bold enough to advise an uncompromising abolition of ancient abuses and restoration of the Mosaic law, war against the Philistines, independence of Assyria, and at the same time the rejection of any alliance with Egypt; and was powerful enough to brave the general corruption, to baffle the plots of the court, and to maintain the courage of the people as well as of the sick king during the great invasion of Sennacherib, when the state was on the brink of ruin. Thus Judah escaped the fate of her sister state, which had a few years before been conquered and devastated by the Assyrians, and which now began to be re-peopled principally by Outhæans, an idolatrous people subject to their rule, who, mingling their rites with those of their new territory about Samaria, became afterward known under the name of Samaritans (*Outhim*), while scattered portions of the ancient Hebrew inhabitants

augmented the number of the subjects of Hezekiah. But the reign of his son Manasseh, longer than that of Uzziah, was more disgraceful than that of Ahaz. Idolatry was not only publicly introduced, but had its altars even on Mount Moriah. The most abominable practices prevailed, including the bloody worship of Moloch, and Jerusalem was filled with the blood of the innocent victims of tyranny, while the limits of the country were narrowed by hostile neighbors. Anon, the son of Manasseh, followed in his father's footsteps, but was murdered after two years. Josiah, his successor, however, was a zealous imitator of Hezekiah, and was assisted in his radical reforms by the reviving influence of the prophets, among whom were Nahum, Zephaniah, the young Jeremiah, and their female colleague Huldah. Nabum celebrated the final fall of Assyria, and the destruction of Nineveh its capital, "the bloody city full of lies and robbery, (whence) the prey departeth not," which was then completed by the allied Babylonians and Medes. But the power of Babylonia, lately founded by Nabopolassar, was now growing to a threatening extent, and the position of the weak kingdom of Judah between this and the rival power of Egypt doomed it to a sudden catastrophe. Pharaoh Necho having commenced a campaign against Babylonia through Philistia, Josiah opposed his march, and fell in the battle of Megiddo. His son Jehoahaz was sent prisoner to Egypt, and the younger Jehoiakim (or Eljakim) appointed king in his stead. The great victory of the Babylonians, however, over Necho on the Euphrates, soon made Jehoiakim a vassal of their empire. He afterward revolted, against the advice of Jeremiah, who saw the impossibility of resisting the sway of Nebuchadnezzar, the successor of Nabopolassar. The king was as little inclined to listen to his counsel in his foreign as he was in his domestic policy. Jeremiah's prophecies were burned. Another prophet, Uriah, was punished for the boldness of his rebukes with death. The Chaldeans soon invaded the country, and were joined by its neighboring enemies. After the death of his father and a short siege of Jerusalem, Jehoiachin or Jeconiah, the son of Jehoiakim, terminated the war by a voluntary surrender to Nebuchadnezzar, who sent him with his family, his army, and thousands of the most important citizens, to Babylonia as captives. The treasures of the temple and royal house were plundered. Mattaniah, an uncle of the dethroned king, was appointed his successor, as vassal of the conqueror, under the name of Zedekiah (598). It was the last reign of the house of David. Zedekiah, a weak prince, was induced by a misguided patriotism to revolt against Nebuchadnezzar. Jeremiah in vain exerted all his zeal and eloquence to dissuade the king and the people from this pernicious step. He was persecuted by both; the seductive influence of false prophets prevailed. The 2d siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar now ensued (588). It fell after a desperate defence.

The king, who attempted to escape with the remnants of his troops, was made prisoner in the neighborhood of Jericho, was deprived of his eyes after having seen the slaughter of his children, and was sent in chains to Babylon. The temple was burned, its vessels were plundered, the walls and palaces of Jerusalem destroyed, and all important or wealthy citizens carried into the Babylonish captivity. Jeremiah was spared and allowed to remain with Gedaliah, whom Nebuchadnezzar appointed his viceroy at Mizpah, and around whom a number of the remaining people soon gathered. But this last centre, too, was soon destroyed by the assassination of Gedaliah. A number of the surviving officers emigrated with their followers and Jeremiah, who tried in vain to dissuade them, to Egypt, whither the sword of the Chaldeans still followed them. The annihilation of the state of Judah was complete. Jerusalem "sits solitary, the city that was full of people is become as a widow; the princess among the provinces is become tributary. She weepeth sore in the night; among all her lovers she hath none to comfort her. Judah is gone into captivity; she finds no rest. The ways of Zion do mourn, because none come to the solemn feasts; all her gates are desolate; her priests sigh, her virgins are afflicted." These elegiac sounds of the "Lamentations" are not the most touching of the numerous effusions that treat that tragic end. Speaking in the name of the Lord, Ezekiel exclaims: "My sheep wandered through all the mountains, and upon every high hill; yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them." Habakkuk, speaking of the Chaldees, "that bitter and hasty nation," asks God: "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity; wherefore lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, when the wicked devoureth him that is more righteous than he?" Jeremiah curses the day of his birth, and accuses God. Providence is also arraigned in the book of Job, a sublime lyrical drama, which numerous critics regard as a production of that time. A number of psalms, too, belong to the last period of the kingdom of Judah. But Babylonia, the prison of the Jewish nation (for this name had now become the most familiar), was destined also to become the cradle of its regeneration. The Babylonish captivity was the "furnace of affliction" which purified it, and, as is said in Zechariah (xiii. 8, 9), two parts perished, but the third part was left therein, brought "into fire as silver is refined, and as gold is tried." The most eminent of the people had been transplanted there with Jeconiah, and afterward, among others, Ezekiel, Daniel, and his pious companions at the court of Nebuchadnezzar, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah; and their activity in reviving the spirit of religion and nationality is evident from the numerous contributions to the Hebrew literature of that period, all glowing with enthusiasm and unconquered hope.

The court, that source of corruption, was no more; the priests of Baal and Moloch, so long fattened on lies, had disappeared with the altars of their idols; the voluptuous groves of Ash-toreth could not be transplanted into the land of dreary captivity; Zion was regretfully remembered on the brooks of Babylon, and the true admonishers of the people, who had predicted all this, now found more willing ears. Their consolations, too, and the deliverance which they promised, were soon to be confirmed; and the captives, who were full of revengeful hatred toward their oppressor, the profligate and treacherous mistress of the world, heard with secret delight of the warlike preparations of the Medo-Persian empire against her. There are no more vigorous passages in the Hebrew Scriptures than those which describe Cyrus, the "servant of the Lord," called to "execute his vengeance," his army, his victorious approach, and the fall of Babylon (538). The last ruler of that city, Belshazzar, was drinking wine with his lords, his wives, and his concubines, from the golden and silver vessels of the temple of Jerusalem, when "one messenger was running to meet another" to tell him "that his city was taken at one end." The Persian conqueror did not disappoint those who had predicted, and perhaps secretly promoted his triumphs. He allowed the Jews to return to their country, where they could be useful by forming a kind of outpost against Egypt, and to rebuild their capital and temple. The first and largest body of returning patriots consisted of more than 42,000 persons, under the lead of Zerubbabel, a prince of the house of David, and the high priest Jeshua. But the idolatrous Samaritans, whom the Jews would not admit to have a share in the new temple, exerted themselves to prevent their rebuilding and fortifying Jerusalem, calumniating them at the court of Persia, particularly under Cambyses (529-'22) and Pseudo-Smerdis (522). Darius, however, fully confirmed the permission of Cyrus (521). The prophets Haggai and Zechariah (assisted, perhaps, by Obadiah, who seems to have been their contemporary) inspired Zerubbabel, the priests, and the people with fresh zeal, and after 5 years the new temple was completed (516). The events which are described in the book of Esther—the elevation of the Jewess of that name (or Hadassah) to the dignity of Persian queen, the high official career of her relative Mordecai, the schemes of Haman, a courtier and personal enemy of the latter, to destroy all the Jews of the Persian empire, his fall, and the almost miraculous escape of the people through Mordecai and Esther—probably refer to the reign of Xerxes (485-'65), the son of Darius, though the name Ahasuerus is used in the Scriptures to designate various monarchs of the Persian empire. Under the following reign of Artaxerxes, Ezra, the pious scribe (or critic, *sofer*), led a new colony of Jews from beyond the Euphrates to Jerusalem, where he carried through a series of important reforms, completing the restoration

of the Mosaic law, for which he was afterward revered as the second lawgiver of his people. The condition of the Jews in Palestine, however, or rather in Jerusalem and its vicinity, was not cheering. The city had no walls or gates, and poverty prevailed. To remedy these evils Nehemiah, the Jewish cup-bearer of Artaxerxes, started from Susa with the permission of the monarch and the dignity of governor (444). The work of restoring and fortifying Jerusalem was now carried on and executed with the utmost zeal, though the laborers were often obliged to work under arms, the Samaritans and their friends threatening an attack. Notwithstanding his dignity, Nehemiah voluntarily shared the toils and privations of his brethren. He restored order, assisted the poor, abolished the abuses of the rich, and strengthened the observance of the law. After a long absence at the royal court, during which fresh disorder had arisen, he resumed his pious and patriotic work, in which he was assisted by Malachi, the last of the known prophets. The enmity of the Samaritans, though baffled in its first assaults, remained active down to a much later period, their separation having been sanctioned by a rival temple on Mount Gerizim. The Jewish temple on Mount Moriah had a successive line of hereditary high priests in the direct descendants of Jeshua, of whom Jaddua held that most influential office at the time of the conquest of the Persian empire by Alexander, whose wrath he is said to have diverted from Jerusalem (332). The names of the Persian governors during the last century of that empire are unknown, this being altogether the most obscure period in the history of the Jews. It seems to have been a time of comparative tranquillity and prosperity; at least it included no particular national disaster, as it added no day of fasting to those recently established in commemoration of the fall of Jerusalem, the death of Gedaliah, &c. But the same century, together with the time of Ezra, may certainly be regarded as the period of the most important religious developments, of a permanent consolidation of Judaism. The first impulse had probably been given in Babylonia, during the active literary period of the captivity. But Ezra the *sofer*, his contemporaries Haggai, Zechariah, Nehemiah, and others, "the men of the great assembly" (*anshey keneseth haggadolah*), and the successive *soferim*, are the real authors of the restoration and the new developments connected with it. The sacred Scriptures were collected, authenticated, and arranged into a canon, including the most precious remnants of a vast literature, among the lost parts of which were the often mentioned and quoted "book Hayashar," probably a collection of historical songs, the book of the "Wars of the Lord," the special "Chronicles" of the kings of Judah and Israel, the prophecies of Nathan, Ahijah, Iddo, and others, the "History of Solomon," various works of this king, and an endless multitude of others; their great number was complained of in the philosophical book

of Ecclesiastes, a work commonly attributed to Solomon, but by numerous critics to a very late period. The Pentateuch was publicly read, taught in schools, explained, hermeneutically expounded (*midrash*), and translated into the Chaldee language, which the common people had adopted in Babylonia, together with various eastern notions concerning angels, spirits, and other supernatural things. The legal or religious traditions, explanatory or complementary to the law of Moses, were traced back through the prophets and elders to that lawgiver, and systematically established as the oral law (*torah* or *debarim shebbaal pek*). New obligations were added to form a kind of "fence" (*seyag*) around the law, preventing its infraction, and founded on the authority of the scholars and wise men of the age (*dibrey soferim, mitzvath zekenim*). The following century and a half, when Judæa was a province of the successors of Alexander in Egypt and Syria, the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ, is marked by new features. Greek refinement, science, and philosophy spread among the Jews, particularly among the flourishing colonies in Alexandria and other cities of the Ptolemies. A part of the people, especially the wealthier, adopted the Epicurean notions of the demoralized Greeks of that time, and were finally organized as a sect, denying the immortality of the soul, rejecting the authority of tradition, and adhering to the literal sense of the Mosaic law; while the teachings of the stoics agreed well with the more austere life of the followers of the "great assembly," who maintained their preponderance with the people. As a sect the former were called Sadducees, the more ascetic of the latter Pharisees. The derivation of both these names is as little settled as is that of the name of the Essenes, who appear about the close of this period, forming secluded, industrious, and socialistic communities, and engaged in medical, mystical, and ascetic practices. The Samaritans, who, adopting in part the Mosaic rites, had succeeded in attaching to their temple a part of the neighboring Jews, now followed the example of the Hellenizing cities of Syria, and made little opposition to the spreading worship of the Greek gods. The Greek language became common in Judæa, and the Greek translation of the Pentateuch prepared under Ptolemy Philadelphus in Egypt (the Septuagint) was used in the synagogues of that country. A Syrian dialect of the Aramaic was used for the same purpose by the Samaritans, and the pure Chaldee prevailed among the Jews beyond the Euphrates. Politically no less than in matters of religion, Judæa seems to have been ruled by the high priests, who had to be confirmed by the Egyptian or Syrian kings, and the sanhedrim of Jerusalem, a college of 70, with a president (*beth din haggadol*, high court). After the death of Alexander (323), the little province frequently changed masters, until it was definitively attached to the empire of Ptolemy I. Soter, under whom the celebrated Simon the Just (or Righteous) officiated as high priest, and Antigonus of

Socho as president of the sanhedrim. The uncertainty of possession made the foreign rulers more lenient. The country was growing in wealth and population, in spite of large colonies drawn to Alexandria by Alexander the Great, Soter, and others. These were particularly well treated, and enjoyed privileges which made them an object of envy. They, like their brethren of Babylonia and other countries of Asia, enriched Jerusalem and the temple by their gifts and visits during festivals. Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (285-246) was especially favorable to the Jews. Under his successors, however, Judæa grew impatient of the Egyptian rule, and when Antiochus the Great attacked the young Ptolemy V., the Jews willingly aided him in driving the Egyptians from their land (198). They soon had reason to regret this change of dynasty. The Seleucidæ were bent on Hellenizing their empire, and were offended by the determination of the Jews to preserve their own national and religious peculiarities. The treasures, too, which had been slowly accumulated in the temple of Jerusalem, tempted their avarice, while they also augmented the number of priestly office seekers. Tyranny and corruption growing together, the dignity of high priest was finally converted into an office for sale. One Onias was robbed of it for the benefit of his younger brother Jason, who offered 360 talents to the court of Syria; a third brother, Menelaus, wrested it from him, giving 300 more, and strove to maintain himself in his usurpation by scandalously promoting the arbitrary schemes of Antiochus Epiphanes. Being driven from the city by Jason and his followers, and besieged in the citadel, he was rescued by Antiochus, who destroyed a part of the city, sold many of his opponents into slavery, and robbed the temple (170). But worse was to follow. During the second expedition of the Syrian king against Egypt, a false report of his death spread in Judæa, and Jerusalem immediately rose against his officers. But the Hellenizing Jews opened its gates to the returning king, and an unparalleled slaughter of the religious inhabitants ensued (169). Not satisfied with this, Antiochus destroyed the walls of the city, garrisoned a new citadel with his soldiers, and decreed the general and exclusive introduction of Greek idolatry. The image of the king was placed in the temple, swine were sacrificed on the altar, new altars were everywhere erected for the obligatory worship of the Olympian Jupiter, the Hebrew Scriptures were burned, circumcision was prohibited, and every act of opposition made a capital crime and punished with extreme cruelty. Thousands after thousands were dragged into captivity, sold as slaves, or butchered. Finally the king departed on an expedition against the Parthians, leaving the completion of his work to his general Apollonius (167). The latter continued it in the spirit of his master, but soon met with a sudden check. Mattathias, an old priest of the village of Modin, and of the distinguished

house of the Asmoneans, and his 5 sons John (Johanán), Simon, Judas, Eleazar, and Jonathan, commanded to sacrifice to Jupiter, drew their swords in defence of their religious liberty, and soon after were able to defend that of others. The people flocked after them into the desert, whence they sallied forth to destroy the altars of their oppressors. Contempt of death gave victory, and victory created new warriors. The work of liberation was successfully commenced when the old patriot died (166), leaving the command in the hands of Judas, who well deserved by his overwhelming victories the surname of the Hammer (*Maccab*), though the name of Maccabees, which is applied to the whole house, and the title of the apocryphal books of their history, may have been derived from the initials of a supposed scriptural sign, or from those of the name of the father, M(i) K(amokha) B(aelim) J(ehovah) ("Who is like thee among the gods, O Everlasting?"), and M(attithyahu) K(ohen) B(en) J(ohanán) (Mattathias the priest, son of Johanán). Terror reigned among the Syrians in Judæa. Their greatly superior forces suffered defeat after defeat under Apollonius, Seron, Lysias, Timotheus, Nicanor, and other generals. Jerusalem was reconquered, the temple purified, a treaty of alliance concluded with the Romans, the traitor Menelaus was executed by order of Antiochus, and the latter soon after died (164). But the bold struggle of the heroic brothers again became desperate. Eleazar (or perhaps another warrior of the same name), rushing through the thickest of the enemy to transpierce an elephant, on which he supposed the young king Eupator himself to be seated, was crushed under the belly of the falling animal. Judas, seeing himself deserted by most of his followers at the approach of an immense host under Bacchides, and having no alternative but flight or death, chose the latter, attacked the Syrians with 800 men, broke through one of their wings, but was surrounded by the other, and perished with all his companions (160). The surviving brothers again fled to the desert of the south, carrying on a desultory warfare, in which John soon after fell. But the protracted struggles for succession to the throne of Syria between the various kings and usurpers who followed Eupator, Demetrius Soter the son of Epiphanes, his pretended brother, Alexander Balas, Demetrius Nicator the son of Soter, Antiochus the son of Balas, Antiochus Sidetes the son of Nicator, and Tryphon, gave Jonathan, who now commanded, and after him Simon, ample opportunity to restore the fortune of the war. Jonathan's friendship was soon sought by the rival pretenders; he made peace with the one or the other, was acknowledged as high priest, *strategus*, and ethnarch of Judæa, and was successful in his long wars, but was finally enticed to an interview with Tryphon, and assassinated with his sons. Simon conquered the citadel of Jerusalem, renewed the alliance with Rome, and was proclaimed an independent prince. The inde-

pendence of Judæa was successfully defended against Antiochus Sidetes under the command of John and Judas his sons, but the old man was soon after assassinated with his sons Judas and Mattathias by his own son-in-law Ptolemy (135). His surviving son, John Hyrcanus, who succeeded him, resisted the invasion of Antiochus Sidetes, concluded a peace, and further developed the independence of the country, extending its limits by the conquest of Idumæa, and of Samaria, which he destroyed, as well as the temple on Mount Gerizim. The Samaritans were thus crushed, but the Sadducees attained great influence under his reign, and the religious dissensions, assuming also a civil aspect, gradually undermined the foundations of the newly restored state. John Hyrcanus, and his sons Aristobulus (106-5) and Alexander Jannæus (105-79), belong to the small number of Maccabees who died a natural death; for the race of priestly warriors, who conquered their dignity by the sword, were doomed to perish by the sword, and only the earlier members of the house who fought for the liberty of their people fell in glorious battles. Aristobulus, who assumed the royal title, ordered the murder of his brother Antigonus, while their mother was starved to death in a dungeon. Alexander Jannæus proved equally barbarous in a war of 6 years against the majority of his people, who abhorred him as a debauched tyrant and Sadducee, and stained his victory by the execution of 800 of the most important rebels before the eyes of his revelling court. Thousands sought refuge in flight, and he was allowed to continue his reign till his death, when he advised his wife to follow an opposite line of policy. She accordingly chose her councillors from among the distinguished men of the national party, and recalled the exiles. Of her two sons, she appointed Hyrcanus high priest, keeping the political rule herself. Dissatisfied with this arrangement, the younger Aristobulus sought for support among the Sadducees, and after the death of their mother (71) a long civil war was waged by the two brothers, which was terminated only by the interference of the Romans, to whom both applied. Scæurus, the lieutenant of Pompey the Great in Syria, decided for the younger of the brothers (63). But Pompey soon after reversed the sentence, besieged Aristobulus in Jerusalem, took the city and the temple, entering both amid streams of blood, and confirmed Hyrcanus as high priest, in which capacity he became tributary ethnarch of the Romans. Aristobulus and his sons, Alexander and Antigonus, were carried as captives to Rome. Judæa, with narrowed limits, was now a province of the Roman republic, which was just advancing to its furthest boundary in the East. In the name of Hyrcanus it was governed by Antipater, his crafty Idumæan minister, who ruled his feeble master, and was finally himself established by Cæsar, after the fall of Pompey (48), as Roman procurator of Judæa. But Aristobulus and his two sons escaped from Rome, and made

desperate efforts to recover their dignity, but all of them perished in the successive attempts. Antigonus procured aid from the Parthians, who, having vanquished Crassus (53) and other Roman generals, invaded Judæa and carried Hyrcanus into captivity. But he finally succumbed to the son of Antipater, Herod, who on his flight to Rome had gained the favor of the new triumvirs, and who now inaugurated under their auspices as a powerful, independent king, the last dynasty in Judæa, the Idumæan (39). This prince, who as if by irony has been called the Great, was the slave of his passions, as well as of the Romans, and the bloody master of his subjects. His ambition made him rival in splendid structures, among which was the rebuilt temple, in the erection of new fortresses, citadels, and cities, and in unlimited sway, the glory of King Solomon, but did not prevent him from basely creeping before Mark Antony, his mistress Cleopatra of Egypt, and his rival Octavianus, and from sacrificing the most sacred customs and usages of the people in order to flatter the vanity of his foreign supporters. Gladiatorial games, statues, and other things abhorred by the Jews, were introduced in their cities, and the Roman eagle was placed on the top of the new temple. The desire of the people for the national house of the Maccabees was to be stifled in the blood of its last descendants, though Herod was himself the husband of Mariamne, the granddaughter of Hyrcanus by her mother Alexandra, and of Aristobulus by her father Alexander. Antigonus was executed by the Romans at Damascus; the old Hyrcanus was enticed from Babylon to share the same fate in Jerusalem; the young and beautiful brother of the queen, the high priest Aristobulus, was treacherously drowned while bathing with the king. Herod's own house followed, treacherous intrigues and the dread of conspiracies demanding new victims. His uncle Joseph, his frantically beloved, beautiful, and noble Mariamne, her mother Alexandra, his two sons by Mariamne, the favorites of the people, perished successively at his order, and finally, 5 days before his own death, his son by another wife, Antipas or Antipater, next to Herod's sister Salome the chief cause of the last murders and of the king's dreadful agonies. The blood of many other innocent persons was shed, attempts at insurrection or regicide being quelled or punished with remorseless rigor. In extent of possessions, however, Herod's reign by far surpassed the power of his predecessors. Augustus divided his territory among his 3 surviving sons. Archelaus received, as ethnarch, half of them, viz. : Judæa (proper), Samaria to the N., and Idumæa to the S. ; Philip and Herod Antipas, as tetrarchs, received the other half—the former, Batanæa, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, E. of the Jordan (Peræa), and the latter, Galilee W. of the Jordan and N. of Samaria, with some slight additions. Anarchy was a natural consequence of this arbitrary arrangement, and it came with all its horrors.—Such was the political condition of the Jewish state in the first

year of the Christian era, 4 years after the birth of the founder of the Christian religion, for an account of whose life, doctrine, and death (in the year 33, under the sway of the Roman procurator Pontius Pilate, the possessions of Archelaus having been annexed to the Roman province of Syria) we refer the reader to special articles under the appropriate heads. The religious and literary institutions of the people had in the meanwhile received a remarkable development during the Asmonean period, on the basis of the *soferim*, and principally under the lead of the successive schools of the *hakhamim* (scholars) Jose of Zeredah and Jose of Jerusalem, Joshua ben (son of) Perachiah and Nittay of Arbel, Judah ben Tabbay and Simeon ben Shetah, and Shemaiah and Abtalion; and it reached a most flourishing condition under the school of the great Hillel the Babylonian, president of the sanhedrim like all the first of the above named pairs, and the rival school of the austere Shammai, in the reign of Herod. The eminent philosophical book of Ben Sirach and the first book of the Maccabees are the products of the earlier part of that period, while the age of the books of Tobit, Judith, Baruch, and other apocryphal writings, is unknown. The simultaneous literary activity of the Jews in Africa is evinced in the book of Wisdom, by their numerous contributions to Hellenistic poetry and history (Jason, Alexander Polyhistor, Ezekiel, &c.), and especially to Platonic philosophy, from Aristobulus, the Jewish teacher of Ptolemy Euergetes, to Philo, the distinguished deputy of the Alexandrian Jews to the Roman emperor Caligula. The emperors were already becoming the exclusive masters of Palestine. Archelaus was carried captive to Gaul under Augustus (8), and separate procurators ruled Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa. Philip's possessions were attached to Syria after his death (35) by Tiberius, but afterward given by Caligula to Herod Agrippa, a grandson of Herod, and brother of Herodias, who, being unlawfully married by Herod Antipas, caused the deposition of the latter, and the annexation of his tetrarchy to the dominion of Agrippa, who even succeeded in reuniting for a short time, in the reign of Claudius, the whole of Palestine. After his death (44) his territory was again ruled by procurators, and only a small portion was afterward given to his son Agrippa II. (53). The condition of the country was dreadful. The emperors, at that time the vilest of men, demanded divine honors, their statues were erected in the temple, the procurators grew rich by extortions, the petty Herodian courts shamelessly imitated the licentiousness of the imperial, robbers infested the mountainous regions, impostors and fanatics raised the standard of rebellion, and insurrections led to new oppression, both religious and civil. Nero's rule, and the extortions of his procurator Gessius Florus, finally drove the people to despair. Death to the Romans or to themselves became the cry of the fanatics and the poor. The Sadducees and the rich oppos-

ed it in vain, though aided by the troops of Agrippa. The temple of Jerusalem, the ancient capital itself, and numerous strongholds in the country were taken by the insurgents (66). The Roman governor of Syria, Cestius Gallus, who hastened to Jerusalem, was routed near that city. The zealots now organized a general rising. The priest Josephus, the historian, was sent to arm and defend Galilee. But one of Nero's best generals, Vespasian, was already approaching from the north (67); and Titus, his son, brought new legions from Egypt. The Jews fought with Maccabean valor near Joppa, at Mt. Gerizim, in the streets of Gamala, at Jotapat, and other places. But Josephus's army perished in the struggle about Jotapat, and he was made prisoner; Galilee was lost, and civil carnage raged within the walls of Jerusalem between the moderates under the priest Eleazar, the terrorists under John of Giscala, and the volunteers under Simon the Idumæan. Vespasian now advanced and took most of the strongholds (68). The events which followed the death of Nero, however, checked his progress. Vespasian himself being proclaimed emperor by his legions (69), Titus took the command. Jerusalem, Masada, Machærus, and Herodium were still to be besieged. The northern part of Jerusalem, Bezetha, was first taken by the Romans with the external wall. The middle wall, too, fell into their hands, but the defenders, now united and heroically fighting, drove them out. The Roman resolved upon conquering by hunger, and this brought pestilence to his assistance. Hay, leather, and insects were finally consumed; the victims could no longer be buried, but were thrown over the wall. Deserters and fugitives were mutilated by the besiegers or driven back. The castle Antonia, and with it the second wall, were finally taken (June, 70). John and Simon still refused to hear of surrender. In August the temple was stormed, and Titus was unable to prevent its becoming a prey to the flames. The last defenders retired to the fortified upper city, which fell in September. Jerusalem was razed to the ground, its surviving inhabitants were slaughtered by thousands, sold into slavery, or doomed to perish in public fights with wild beasts before Romans and Greeks, at the command of the future *amor et delicia generis humani*. Herodium, Machærus, and Masada still defended themselves for a time. In the latter the conquerors found only a few children, the last men having died by their own hands. A million of Jews perished in this war, which found an eloquent but partial historian in the learned captive Josephus. The later and still more furious risings of the scattered people in the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian in Cyrene, Egypt, Cyprus, and Palestine, where Bar-Cokeba for years victoriously maintained himself against the Roman generals until he fell with his last stronghold Bcthar, are known only from scattered passages full of exaggerations, dictated by hatred on one side and patriotic admiration

on the other.—The last insurrection, and the bloody persecutions which followed it, finally broke the strength and spirit of the people. Their leaders prohibited every attempt at insurrection in the name of religion, and were obeyed. Hadrian's *Ælia Capitolina* rose on the sacred ground of Jerusalem, and his decrees forbade the Jews to enter its precincts. Its environs were desolate. The land of Israel was no more; the people scattered all over the world. The previous invasions and conquests, civil strifes and oppression, persecution and famine, had carried hosts of Jewish captives, slaves, fugitives, exiles, and emigrants, into the remotest provinces of the Medo-Persian empire, all over Asia Minor, into Armenia, Arabia, Egypt, Cyrene, Cyprus, Greece, and Italy. The Roman conquest and persecutions completed the work of dispersion, and we soon find Jews in every part of the empire, in the regions of Mt. Atlas, on both sides of the Pyrénées, on the Rhine and Danube. Palestine, however, for some time continued to be a national centre through its schools of religious science, which after the desolation of Jerusalem flourished at Jamnia, Lydda, Usha, Sephoris, Tiberias, and other places, principally under the lead of the presidents of the sanhedrim (patriarchs, *nesiim*) of the house of Hillel, of whom Gamaliel Hazzaken (the Elder), his son Simeon, his grandson Gamaliel, and great-grandson Simeon, with their celebrated fellow *tanaim* (teachers or scholars) Johanan ben Zakkay, Eliczer, Joshua, Eleazar, Ishmael, Tarphon, the great Akiba, and others, had been successfully active during the previous disastrous period. The succeeding rabbis (*rabbi*, my master), Ben Azay, Ben Zoma, the 5 pupils of Akiba, Eliezer, Meir, Jose, Jehudah, Simeon, Nathan, and others, continued their work by public teaching, as well as by collecting, elucidating, systematizing, and further developing the decisions (*halakhoth*, collectively termed *Halakhah*) of the oral law, which was finally converted into a written code or compendium of teachings (*Mishna*) by the patriarch Jehudah the Holy and his school, during the mild reign of the Antonines. To this were added the partly supplementary, partly explanatory works, *Tosefta*, *Mekhilta*, *Safra*, and *Sifre*. These works became the basis of religious study in the subsequent 3 centuries, in Palestine, as well as in Babylonia, where the schools of Sura, Pumbeditha, Nehardea, and others, flourished under more favorable circumstances, the most renowned teachers (in this period *amoraim*) of both countries being Rab, Samuel, Joshua ben Levi, Johanan, Simeon ben Lakish, the patriarch Jehudah II., Amc, Ase, Abahu, Eleazar, Jehudah, Hunna, Hisda, Nahman, Rabbah, Joseph, Zera, Jeremiah, Abbayi, Raba, Pappa, Ashe, Abina, and Mar bar (ben) Ashe (died 467). After new persecutions by the Christian emperors, which destroyed the schools (353) and the patriarchate (429) of Palestine, and by the Persian kings Yezdegerd II., Hormuz, Firuz, and Kobad in the latter part of the 5th century,

which destroyed the schools of Babylonia, the results of those studies were also collected, though in chaotic disorder, in the two Gemaras or Talmuds (literally, studies), the Palestinian and Babylonian. Other extant products of the time of the *tanaim* and *amoraim* were various ethical treatises (*Derekh eretz*, *Aboth*, &c.), historical, legendary, and cosmogonical writings (*haggadoth*, stories, collectively *Haggadah*, a vast branch), prayers (*tefilloth*), additions to the Chaldee paraphrase (*Targum*) of scriptural books, a new calendar, admirably adapted to the religious duties of the people, by Hillel (340), and some Greek fragments by Aquila and Symmachus. The Chaldee, often with an admixture of Hebrew, was now generally used in literary works, while the people used the various languages of the countries in which they lived. More and more oppressed and degraded by the emperors, of whom only Julian was favorable to his Jewish subjects, and who even attempted to rebuild the temple of Zion, and by the decrees of the councils, the Jews of Palestine once more hoped to recover their independence when they assisted the Persians in conquering Jerusalem (610), but were soon severely chastised for their rash attempt by the victorious emperor Heraclius. But a new power springing from the Arabian desert was destined to humiliate all the contending parties and sects between the Tigris and the Nile, the Byzantine emperors and the Sassanide shahs, Christians, fire worshippers, and Jews. A new Semitic prophet arose in the vicinity of the Red sea, teaching his disciples and people a monotheism which was to be carried triumphantly over a great part of Asia, Africa, and Europe (622). Mohammed himself after a long struggle conquered the castles of the independent Jews in Arabia, who, living from a very remote period in that country, were masters both of the poetical tongue and the sword of the desert, their warlike Samuel ben Abdiah, among others, being one of the most distinguished early poets of the peninsula. Omar and his generals conquered Jerusalem, Tiberias, Damascus, Antioch, and Alexandria from the Byzantines, and subdued Persia, thus bringing most of the eastern Jews under the rule of Islam. This proving comparatively mild, and the later caliphs favoring every science, Jewish studies revived, especially in Babylonia, where the Jews lived under the immediate rule of a prince of the captivity (*resh gelutha*), and where their great schools, having been reorganized under the *seboraim* (thinkers), were made flourishing under the *geonim* (the eminent), of whom Saadia (died 941), the translator of the Pentateuch into Arabic, and Hai (died 1037), the son of Sherira, and son-in-law of Samuel ben Hofni, are eminent as theological writers, poets, and linguists. Numerous works of *Haggadah*, now mostly known as *midrashim*, and ethical writings, were composed; the critical notes of the Masora and the "Targum of Jerusalem" elaborated; the admirable system of scriptural vocalization introduced; talmudical compendiums

written; medical, astronomical, and linguistic studies, and also cosmogonical speculations (*cabbala*), pursued. An anti-rabbinical sect, beside the extinct Sadducees, the only one which deserves that appellation, was founded about the middle of the 8th century by Anan in Babylonia, receiving from their strict adherence to the letter of the Bible the name of Caraites (Scripturists). Their scholars, Salmon, Jeshua, and Jefeth, flourished in the 10th century. Scientific pursuits also spread among the Jews in Africa, who with slight interruptions enjoyed peace under the Saracenic princes; and among the theological writers of Fez and Kairouan in that period, of whom Nissim and Hananel (both in the 1st half of the 11th century) are the most celebrated, we find the physician and critic Isaac ben Soleyman, the lexicographer Hefetz, and the grammarians Ben Koràish, Dunash, and Hayug. The Arabic was generally used by the scholars.—The political and intellectual condition of the Jews was worse in the Byzantine empire and in the feudal states which arose on the ruins of the western. Deprived of most civil rights, they were now and then bloodily persecuted, as by the Franks and Visigoths in the 6th and 7th centuries, by the Byzantines in the 8th, when many of them fled and even spread their religion among the Khazars about the Caspian sea, and again in the 11th, about which time they appear in Russia, though only for a short time, and in Hungary. More tolerable, however, was their situation in Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia, where they often found protection through the influence of the popes. Bari and Otranto became the principal seats of Jewish learning. The renowned Eleazer ben Kalir and other writers of *piyutim* (liturgical songs in Hebrew rhymed verse), the historian Josipon, and the astronomer Shabthay Donolo, flourished in Italy in the 9th and 10th centuries, and the lexicographer Nathan in the 11th. From Italy science spread to the cities on the Rhine, to Lorraine and France. In the 11th and 12th centuries we find in Germany Simeon, the author of the talmudical *Yalkut* ("Gleaning Bag"), the poet Samuel the Pious, and the writer of travels Petahiah; in northern France, Gerson, surnamed the "light of the exiled," the liturgical poet Joseph Tob Elem, the renowned commentators Solomon Isaaki and his grandson Solomon ben Meir, and the authors of the talmudical *Tosafoth* ("Additions"), Isaac ben Asher, Jacob ben Meir, &c. Spain, after the conquest by the Saracens, who carried thither culture, science, and poetry, was destined to develop the most prosperous and flourishing condition which the Jews enjoyed in the middle ages. Persecutions became rare and exceptional. The Jews enjoyed civil rights and rose to high dignities in the state under the Moorish princes, and were almost as well treated by the Christian monarchs, and their culture and progress in science not only kept pace with their prosperity, but also outlived occasional adversity. In the 10th century we see there the lexicographer

Menahem, the astronomer Hassan, and the rich, liberal, and scientific Hasdai, the friend and physician of the caliph Abderrahman III., at Cordova; in the 11th the talmudical scholars Samuel Halleli and Isaac Alfasi (of Fez), the grammarian Abulwalid, the philosopher David Mokamez, the ethical writer Behay, and Solomon Gabirol, equally celebrated as Hebrew poet and Arabic philosopher; in the 12th the theologian Abraham ben David, the astronomer and geographer Abraham ben Hiya, the poet Moses ben Ezra, the traveller Benjamin of Tudela, the scientific poet Jehudah Halleli, whose glowing songs rival the beauties and purity of the Psalms, the great critic, philosopher, and poet Aben Ezra, and finally Moses Maimonides, who as a philosopher, as well as writer on the law, by far surpassed all his contemporaries. The diffusion of science among the Jews now attained its height in Europe, as well as in Egypt, whither Maimonides fled after a persecution at Cordova (1157), and where he and his son Abraham officiated as physicians to the court of the sultan. Spain numbered among its vast number of scholars in the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries, the poets Charizi, the Hebrew imitator of the Arabian Hariri, and Sahola; the astronomers Aben Sid, the author of the Alfonsine tables, Israeli, and Alhadev; the philosophical theologians Palquera, Lattef, Caspi, Hasdai, Albo, and Shemtob; the celebrated commentators Nahmanides, Addereth, Gerundi, Behay, Yomtob, and Nissim; the cabalists Todros, Gecatilia, Abelafia, and De Leon. In Provence and Languedoc, where high schools flourished in Lunel, Nimes, Narbonne, Montpellier, and Marseilles, from the 12th to the 15th century, we find the 3 grammarians Kimhi and their follower Ephodi; the poets Ezobi, Jedaiah, and Calonymus; the commentators Zerahiah Halleli, Abraham ben David, and Menahem ben Solomon; the philosophers Levi ben Abraham, Levi ben Gerson, and Vidal; the 4 Tibbons, all translators from Arabic into Hebrew, and the lexicographer Isaac Nathan. Italy had in the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries the poets Immanuel, an imitator of Dante, Moses de Rieti, and Messir Leon; the talmudists Trani and Colon; the cabalist Recanate; the astronomer Immanuel; various grammarians and translators from Arabic and Latin; and finally the philosopher Elias del Medigo. Germany had in the same period the talmudists Meir, Mordecai, Asher and his son Jacob, and Isserlin, the cabalist Eleazar, and others. The Caraites, too, had a number of scholars, as Hadassi, the two Aarons, and others. During the earlier part of this long period of literary activity in the West the Jews enjoyed peace and prosperity, with various interruptions, in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, the islands of the Mediterranean, in Hungary, especially under the national kings, and in Poland, which hospitably received the numerous exiles from all neighboring countries, under the Piasts, particularly the last of them, Casimir the Great; but there

were none in Muscovy and in the Scandinavian states; and in England, where they appear before the time of Alfred, in France, where only the early Carolingians, and especially Charlemagne, favored them, and throughout Germany, their condition was in the last degree deplorable. Circumscribed in their rights by decrees and laws of the ecclesiastical as well as civil power, excluded from all honorable occupations, driven from place to place, from province to province, compelled to subsist almost exclusively by mercantile occupations and usury, overtaxed and degraded in the cities, kept in narrow quarters and marked in their dress with signs of contempt, plundered by lawless barons and penniless princes, an easy prey to all parties during the civil feuds, again and again robbed of their pecuniary claims, owned and sold as serfs (*Kammerknechte*) by the emperors, butchered by mobs and revolted peasants, chased by the monks, burned in thousands by the crusaders, who also burned their brethren of Jerusalem in their synagogue, tormented by ridicule, abusive sermons, monstrous accusations and trials, threats and experiments of conversion, the Jews of those countries offer in their mediæval history a frightful picture of horrors and gloom. In England they had their worst days in the reigns of Richard I., at whose coronation they were frightfully massacred at York (1189), John, Henry III., and Edward I., who expelled them altogether from the realm (1290). From France they were for the last time banished under Charles VI. (1395). Germany, where the greatest anarchy prevailed, was the scene of their bloodiest persecutions, the most frightful of which took place in the cities on the Rhine during the great desolation by the black plague, which depopulated Europe from the Volga to the Atlantic (1348-'50). Pointed out to the ignorant people as having caused the pestilence by poisoning the wells, the Jews were burned by thousands on the public squares, or burned themselves with their families in the synagogues. Almost every imperial city had a general persecution of the Jews. The Swiss towns imitated their neighbors, almost all banishing their Jews. With the growing influence of the inquisition the Jews of southern Europe, too, suffered the same fate. The protection of the popes being gradually withdrawn, they were banished from the cities of Italy into separate quarters (*ghetti*), and obliged to wear distinctive badges; persecutions became more frequent; in 1493 all the Jews of Sicily, about 20,000 families, were banished. In Spain, during a long drought in 1391-'2, the Jewish inhabitants were massacred in many cities. The condition of the Jews grew worse in the following century, until their extirpation from the whole country was determined upon, and, after repeated but fruitless attempts at conversion by the stake, finally carried into effect by Ferdinand and Isabella (1492). More than 70,000 families sought refuge in Portugal, where for a large sum of money the fugitives were allowed

to remain for a few months, in Africa, Italy, Turkey, and other countries. Not the 5th part of them survived the horrors of compulsory expatriation, shipwreck, and subsequent famine. The feeling observer may find a compensation in the fact that while these events happened propitious winds carried three small caravals across the Atlantic to a new world, whose enervating treasures were destined to assist the inquisition in undermining the power of the oppressors, and whose future institutions were to inaugurate an era of freedom to the descendants of the oppressed. The Jews of Portugal were banished soon after (1495) by King Emanuel, being robbed of their children under 14 years of age, who were sent to distant islands to be brought up as Christians. The numerous converted Jews of the peninsula and their descendants were still persecuted for more than two centuries by governments, inquisitors, and mobs. These persecutions, which eventually carried the bulk of the European Jewish population into the provinces of Poland and Turkey, similar events in the East during the crusades, a long series of persecutions in Germany, and in central and southern Italy in the 16th century, and bloody massacres by the revolted Cossacks under Ohmielnicki in the S. E. regions of Poland, together with a general and minutely developed system of petty oppression, extortion, and degradation, to which the Jews were subjected in most parts of Europe during the 250 years following their expulsion from the Iberian peninsula, could not but exercise a disastrous influence upon the culture and literature of the people. The spirit of cheerful inquiry, study, and poetry which distinguished the Spanish-Provençal period, was gone. The critical knowledge and use of the Hebrew was neglected, the study of the Talmud and its commentaries became the almost exclusive occupation of the literary youth, and cabalistic speculations replaced philosophy, producing in Poland various schools of religious enthusiasts called *Hasidim* (pietists). A bold Turkish Jew, Shabthay Tzebi, who, like the Persian Aldaud or Alroy in the 12th century, was proclaimed by his cabalistic followers the expected Messiah of Israel, found numerous adherents even in various parts of Europe (1666), whose delusion was destroyed only by his compulsory conversion to Mohammedanism. Literature and science, however, still found scattered votaries, especially in northern Italy, Turkey, and Holland; and beside the great talmudists, theologians, or commentators of this period, Don I. Abarbanel, I. Arama, J. and L. Hâbib, Mizrahi, O. Bartenura, O. Sforno, I. Luria, T. Karo, the author of the talmudical abridgment or code *Shulhan arukh*, E. Ashkenazi, Alshchikh, S. Luria, M. Isserels, M. Jafeh, Sirks, S. Cohen, Lion of Prague, E. Lentshitz, J. Trani, J. Hurwitz, H. Vital, S. Edels, Y. Heller, Shabthay Cohen, A. Able, D. Oppenheimer, the collector of the best Hebrew library (now in Oxford), Tzebi Ashkenazi, H. Silva, J. Rosanis,

D. Fränkel, J. Eybeschütz, J. Emden, H. Landau, Elias of Wilna, &c., we find the philosophers and men of science Bibago, S. Cohen, Amatus, Almosnino, De Castro, A. Zacchuto, J. del Medigo, M. Hefetz, and Nieto; and among the poets, grammarians, critics, lexicographers, and historical writers, De Balnes, Elias Levita, A. Farissol, Solomon ben Melekh, Jacob ben Hayim, Gedaliah Jahiah, A. de Rossi, De' Pomi, D. Gans, S. Arkevolte, Lonsano, Manasseh ben Israel, the defender of the Jews before Cromwell, S. Norzi, S. Luzzato, Leo de Modena, S. Mortera, J. Orobio, Shabthay ben Joseph, B. Mussaphia, De Lara, J. Cardoso, J. Abendana, S. Hanau, M. H. Luzzato, J. Heilprin, Azulai, and others. Beyond the limits of the Turkish empire there was scarcely any trace of Jewish literature in the East, though there were and are still numerous Jewish communities in Persia, northern Arabia, Independent Tartary, and Afghanistan, as well as scattered colonies, mostly of more or less mixed race and religion, in India, China, Cochin China, Yemen, Abyssinia, and other parts of Africa, partly of very ancient date, partly founded by escaped Portuguese and Spanish New Christians, some of whom also settled in parts of Brazil and Guiana during the occupation by the Dutch. In Europe the last of the three great religious struggles, against paganism, against Mohammedanism, and between the contending Christian sects, all of which were destructive to the Jews, was terminated by the peace of Westphalia (1648). Catholicism was triumphant in the south and in France, Protestantism in the north and north-west. The greater persecutions of the Jews now ceased. They became flourishing in the republics of Holland and Venice and their dependencies, were readmitted into England by Cromwell (having also entered Denmark and returned into France), spread with the Dutch and English to various parts of America, reëntered Russia under Peter the Great (to be expelled afterward), were admitted in Sweden, and were protected and often employed in high stations by the sultans of Turkey and Morocco. In Germany and Switzerland, where the struggle was not terminated by any decisive triumphs, the mediæval treatment of the Jews was continued longest, its worst features being maintained and developed in Austria (excepting in the reign of Joseph II.), where down to the revolution of 1848 the Jews were excluded from all civil rights, numerous professions, and various provinces, districts, towns, villages, and streets, paying beside a tax for toleration in Hungary, in spite of the remonstrances of the legislatures, a tax upon their sabbath lights in Galicia, and a residence tax when visiting Vienna; while their houses in Moravia were often searched in the night of the sabbath for the purpose of surprising the returned Jewish peddlers who had been secretly married before the extinction of all older brothers, which was prohibited by a Pharaonic law. The general progress of freedom was promoted in the age of philosophy by the appearance of Spinoza and

Mendelssohn (1729-'86) among this long despised people. The influence of the latter upon Jews and Christians through his works, example, fame, and friends (the great Hebrew poet Wessely, Euchel, Löwe, Friedländer, &c., among Jews, and Lessing, Dohm, Abt, Nicolai, Engel, Ramler, &c., among Christians), was immense; and his admirers could say: "Between Moses (the law-giver) and Moses (Mendelssohn) there was only one Moses (Maimonides)." Progress now became general among the Jews, and the noble philosopher lived to see the first dawn of freedom in the land of Franklin and Jefferson. The great revolution in that of Voltaire and Rousseau came next, and the triumphs of republican and imperial France destroyed the mediæval institutions on the Rhine and Po. Liberty, crushed in Poland by the Russians, when 500 of Kosciuszko's Jewish volunteers fell fighting to the last on the ramparts of Praga (1794), was successively victorious in the West. Proclaimed in the United States and France, the rights of the Jews were recognized in Holland, Belgium, Denmark, parts of Germany, Canada, and Jamaica; in 1848-'9 throughout Germany, Italy, and Hungary; and finally in Norway and England. Among the most zealous defenders of the rights of the Jews were the Frenchman Grégoire, the Pole Czacki, the German Welcker, the Irishman O'Connell, the Englishman Lord John Russell, the Italian D'Azeglio, and the Hungarian Eötvös, all Christians; the Jews by descent Börne and Disraeli, and the professing Jews Jacobssohn, Tugendhold, Riesser, Philipsohn, Montefiore, and Crémieux. The revolutionary movement of 1848-'9 proved the immense progress of the Jews as well as of public opinion since Mendelssohn and Lessing. The Jews Crémieux, Goudchaux, and Fould (now minister of state) were among the ministers of the French republic; Pincherle was a member of the provisional government in Venice; Jacobi of Königsberg was the leader of the opposition in the Berlin parliament; Riesser was vice-president of that of Frankfort; Dr. Fischhof stood at the head of affairs in Vienna after the flight of the court; Meisels, the rabbi of Cracow, was elected to the Austrian diet by Polish patriots; and Hungarian barons and counts willingly fought under Jewish officers of higher rank, of whom the adjutant of Gen. Nagy-Sándor, Freund, afterward became Mahimoud Pasha during the war in Turkey. The subsequent reaction, as in Austria, where it was checked by the events of 1859, was mostly temporary, and the Mortara case in Italy in 1858 has excited a very general expression of opposition to the antique legislation by which it was decided. Of the vast number of Jewish writers after Mendelssohn we mention only a few: the talmudists Jacob of Dubno, Jacob of Slonim, Pick, Jacob of Lissa, Bonet, Eger, Sofer, Chajes; the Hebrew poets, philologists, or critics, E. Luzzato, S. Cohen, Satanow, Wolfsohn, Bensev, Pappenheim, Tropowitz, Heidenheim, Löwisohn, S. Bloch, Simha of Hrubieszow, Jeitteles, Landau, Reggio, Perl, N. Krochmal,

the great rabbinical critic Rapoport, S. D. Luzzato, Letteris, Eichbaum, P. M. Heilprin, S. Sachs, Kirchheim, Schorr, A. Krochmal; the historians, critics, or publicists on Jewish subjects in modern languages, Zunz, Jost, Riesser, Geiger, Fürst, Philippson, Salvador, Munk, Cohen, Dukes, Frankel, M. Sachs, Jelinek, Herzfeld, Saalschütz, Steinschneider, Grätz, Löw, Raphael (New York), Leiser (Philadelphia), Wise (Cincinnati); the conservative theologians Plessner, Johlsohn, Steinheim, and Hirsch; the advocates of religious reform (beside Geiger and Herzfeld) Chorin, Creizenach, Stein, Herxheimer, Holdheim, Hess, Stern, Einhorn (Baltimore), Lilienthal (Cincinnati); the pulpit orators Mannheimer, Kley, Salomon, Frankfurter; the philosophers Maimon, Bendavid, Frank; the mathematicians Witzenshausen, Sklow, A. Stern; the astronomers W. Beer, Stern, Slonimski; the ichthyologist Bloch; the physiologist Valentin; the anatomist Hirschfeld; the poets Kuh, M. Beer, Frankl, Léon Halévy; the miscellaneous writers Auerbach, M. M. Noah, Grace Aguilar, Jules Janin; the orientalists Weil, Dernburg, Oppert (beside Munk). Politics, law, medicine, and the arts, including the stage (Mlle. Rachel, &c.), have had numerous representatives, and especially music (Meyerbeer, Halévy, Herz, &c.).—The number of Jews in all parts of the world is hardly less than 4,500,000, or more than 6,000,000.—The HEBREW LANGUAGE (Heb. *ibrith*, or *lashon ibrith*, Hebrew tongue, also *leshon hakkodesh*, sacred tongue, in post-biblical Jewish works; *yehudith*, Jewish, in the biblical history of the period following the captivity of the 10 tribes; in Isaiah, poetically, also *sefath kanaan*, language of Canaan), together with scanty remnants of the Phœnician and Punic, belongs to the so called Canaanitic branch or chief division of the Semitic family of languages, the other branches being the Aramaic and Arabian. In the antiquity of its extant literary remnants the Hebrew by far surpasses all other Semitic idioms, and in richness and development exceeds all others except the Arabic. The Hebrew is deficient in grammatical technicalities, especially in moods and tenses of the verb, and consequently also somewhat in precision; but in euphony, simplicity, brevity, variety of signification, and power of poetical expression, it is hardly excelled by any tongue. In its full purity the Hebrew appears in the earlier books of the Bible, in the mediæval poetical works of R. Jehudah Hallevi, Aben Ezra, &c., and in the modern poems of Wessely, S. Cohen, and others. The prose writings posterior to the Babylonish captivity are generally tinged with Aramaisms, especially the *Mishna*, which also contains numerous Greek words, while the mixed idiom of the *Gemara* and its commentaries may be termed Chaldaic rather than Hebrew. In the middle ages pure Hebrew was used only in poetical prose; in modern times it is used exceptionally in simple prose. In the East and in Poland the Hebrew is often

used in correspondence, in the East occasionally also as a medium of conversation with occidental Jews. Of the various modes of Hebrew pronunciation the *sefaradic* (improperly Portuguese), or that of the descendants of the exiles from Spain and Portugal, is regarded by scholars as the most genuine. There are three kinds of Hebrew alphabets now in use: the square, also called the Assyrian (properly Babylonian), which is generally supposed to have been introduced by Ezra, the most common in print; the rabbinical or mediæval, used chiefly in commentaries and notes; and the cursive, in writing. The most ancient Hebrew, however, is believed by many critics more to have resembled the Phœnician, and to be best represented by the Maccabean coins and the alphabet of the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch. The writing is from right to left. The alphabet consists of 22 letters or consonants, the vowels being expressed by marks above or below the letters. Five letters have a separate final form. There are no capital letters. The accents and marks of punctuation are very numerous. The following examples will exhibit some of the most interesting features of the language: *Kol*, (a) voice, *hakkol*, the voice; *gan*, garden, *haggan*, the garden; *shem*, name, *hashshem*, the name. *Dod*, uncle, *dodah*, aunt; *dod zaken*, an old uncle, *dodah zekenah*, an old aunt; *dodim zekenim*, old uncles, *dodoth zekenoth*, old aunts; *sheney dodim*, two uncles, *shetey dodoth*, two aunts. *Oznayim*, *raglayim*, *alpayim*, two (a couple of) ears, feet, thousands. *Banim*, sons, *banoth*, daughters; *beney david*, *benoth david*, sons, daughters of David. *Ani* (ee) *gadol*, I am great, *hu* (oo) *gadol*, he is great, *hem gedolim*, they are great. *Koli* (ee), my voice, *kolo*, his voice, *kolam*, their voice. *Lemosheh*, to Moses, *bemosheh*, in Moses, *kemosheh*, like Moses, *middavid*, from David. *Bo*, in him, *lo*, to him; *banu*, in us, *lanu*, to us. *Beyn*, between; *beyn mosheh vedavid*, between Moses and David; *beyni ubeyno*, between me and him. *Min*, from; *gadol middavid*, greater than David. *Golyath raah eth david*, Goliath saw (looked at) David; *golyath heref eth david*, Goliath insulted (mocked at) David; *david hikkah eth golyath*, David struck (at) Goliath. *Shamor*, to guard; *eshmor*, I shall guard, *tishmor*, thou wilt guard, *nishmor*, we shall guard; *shamarti*, I (have) guarded, *shamarnu*, we guarded, *shemartem*, ye guarded; *ani shomer*, (I am guarding) I guard, *hu shomer*, he guards, *hem shomerim*, they guard; *shamar*, (he) guarded, *nishmar*, was guarded, *hishtammer*, guarded himself; *lishmor*, to guard, *bishmor*, in guarding, *mishmor*, from guarding; *mosheh shamar*, Moses guarded; *miryam shamera*, Miriam guarded. Among the eminent modern Christian writers (the Jewish being mentioned in the literary parts of this article) on Hebrew history, literature, or language are Reuchlin, the two Buxtorfs, Lowth, Basnage, Michaelis, Eichhorn, Herder, Rosenmüller, Jahn, Gesenius, De Wette, Ewald, Quatremère, Milman, Robinson, Noyes, Stuart, Bush, and Renan.

History of Revivals" (1859). A collection of his public addresses and reviews has also been published, and a volume, entitled "Revival Conversations." Dr. Humphrey was, if not the first, one of the earliest pioneers in the modern temperance reformation. In 1810 he preached 6 sermons on the ravages of intemperance; and in 1813, in connection with the Rev. Messrs. Swan and Bonney, drew up a report to the Fairfield consociation, which had a wide circulation, and is believed to have been the first tract published on that subject.

HUMPHREYS, a N. W. co. of Tenn., bounded E. by Tennessee river, and intersected near its S. border by Duck river, a tributary of the former stream; area, 375 sq. m.; pop. in 1850, 6,422, of whom 1,097 were slaves. The surface is moderately uneven, and the soil is fertile. The productions in 1850 were 419,387 bushels of Indian corn, 30,173 of oats, 23,149 of sweet potatoes, 11,045 lbs. of tobacco, and 89,656 of butter. There were 18 grist mills, 6 saw mills, 21 churches, and 1,922 pupils attending public schools. Capital, Waverley.

HUMPHREYS, DAVID, an American poet, born in Derby, Conn., in 1753, died in New Haven, Feb. 21, 1818. He was educated at Yale college, where he was connected with Dwight and Trumbull, entered the army at the beginning of the revolutionary war, and in 1780 became a colonel and aide-de-camp to Gen. Washington. He resided more than a year with Washington after his retirement to Virginia, and again in 1788. In 1784 he accompanied Jefferson to Europe as secretary of legation, was elected to the legislature of Connecticut in 1786, and was soon associated with Hopkins, Trumbull, and Barlow in the composition of the "Anarchiad," being thus one of "the four bards with Scripture names" satirized in London. He was minister to Lisbon from 1791 to 1797, and afterward minister to Spain till 1802, and on his return imported from Spain 100 merino sheep, and engaged in the manufacture of woollens. He held command of two Connecticut regiments in the war of 1812, after which he lived in retirement. His principal poems are: an "Address to the Armies of the United States" (1772); a "Poem on the Happiness of America;" a tragedy, entitled the "Widow of Malabar," translated from the French of Le Mierre; and a "Poem on Agriculture." His "Miscellaneous Works" (New York, 1790 and 1804) contain beside his poems a biography of Gen. Putnam and several orations and other prose compositions.

HUMUS (Lat. *humus*, the ground), a name of no definite signification, that has been applied to various compounds resulting from the decay of woody fibre or of different vegetable and animal substances, presented in the form of a brown pulverulent substance, as that which forms a large portion of vegetable mould. Boullay regarded it as identical with ulmic acid, but no definite compound is now recognized by this name, nor by that of humic acid, formerly separated from it.

HUMUYA, a river of Honduras, rising at the S. extremity of the plain of Comayagua, and flowing due N. for a distance of about 80 m. to a point near the town of Yojoa, where it unites with the rivers Blanco and Santiago or Venta, forming the great river Ulua, which falls into the bay of Honduras, about 25 m. to the eastward of the port of Omoa. For the greater part of its course it is a rapid stream, and only navigable for canoes. It is principally interesting in connection with the proposed interoceanic railway through Honduras, which is laid out through its valley. Comayagua, the capital of Honduras, stands on its E. bank.

HUNDRED, the name given in some parts of England to the subdivision of a shire, which may have received the appellation from having comprised 100 families, 100 warriors, or 100 manors. The existing divisions of this name differ greatly in area and population. The hundred is by some considered to have been a Danish institution, adopted by King Alfred about 897, each county being divided into tithings, of which 10 or 12 made a hundred, presided over by a decanus, head borough, or hundred-man. The hundreds were represented in the "shire-mote," which, under the presidency of its earl and bishop or sheriff, regulated the affairs of the county. The jurisdiction of the hundred was vested in the sheriff, although it was sometimes a special grant from the crown to individuals, and he or his deputy held a court baron, or court leet. The hundred was held responsible for felons until delivered up.

HUNGARY (Hung. *Magyarország*, Magyar land; Germ. *Ungarn*), a country of Europe, formerly an independent kingdom, subsequently united with Austria, and since 1849 a crownland or province of the latter. Before 1849 it embraced in a constitutional sense, beside Hungary proper, Croatia, Slavonia, and the Hungarian Littorale (coast land on the Adriatic), and in its widest acceptation also Transylvania, the Military Frontier, and Dalmatia, with an aggregate population of about 15,000,000. All these dependencies having been detached, and beside them from Hungary proper the counties of Middle Szolnok, Zaránd, and Kraszna, and the district of Kővár, to be reunited with Transylvania, and the counties of Bács, Torontál, Temes, and Krassó, to form the new crownland of the Servian Waywodeship and Banat, the crownland of Hungary in its most limited sense under Francis Joseph is bounded N. W., N., and N. E. by the Carpathians, which separate it from Moravia, Austrian Silesia, Galicia, and Bukovina, S. E. and E. by Transylvania, S. by the Waywodeship and Banat (from which it is partly separated by the Maros), by Slavonia and Croatia (from which it is separated by the Drave), and W. by Styria and Austria, being situated between lat. 45° 30' and 49° 40' N., and long. 16° and 25° E.; pop. about 9,000,000. Hungary in its chief parts forms a large basin surrounded almost entirely by mountain ranges, of which the principal are, the Carpathians, which encircle the north, with

their various offshoots, the ore mountains between the Waag and the Eipel, the Mátra, E. of the preceding, and the wine-growing Hegyalja between the Theiss and the Hernád; the Leitha range, the wooded Bakony, and the Vértes, mostly continuations of the Noric and Carnic Alps, in the S. W. division, and the Transylvanian Alps on the S. E. frontier. The chief artery of the country is the Danube, which enters it between Vienna and Presburg, and on its course to the Black sea receives the waters of all the other rivers, excepting only the Poprád, which rises near the N. boundary and flows to the Vistula. The principal of these affluents of the Danube are, on the right, the Leitha, Raab, Sárviz, and the Drave, which separates Hungary proper from Slavonia, with the Mur, its affluent; on the left, the March, Waag, Neutra, Gran, Eipel, and the Theiss, which rises in the N. E., in the county of Mármaros, with its affluents, the Bodrog, Hernád, Sajó, and Zagyva on the right, and the Szamos, Körös, and Maros on the left. Most of the rivers of the now detached provinces also flow into the Danube, among others the Save on the Turkish frontier and the Alt from Transylvania. The S. W. division, which has the fewest rivers, includes the two great lakes of the country, the Balaton and the Neusiedler. Various marshes, moors, soda lakes, and swamps extend near the banks of the great rivers, especially of the Theiss. There are also numerous mountain lakes called "eyes of the sea," and caverns, of which that of Agtelek in the county of Gömör is the most remarkable. Extensive islands are formed by the branches of the Danube, among others the Great Schütt and Csepel in its upper course. The climate is in general mild, owing to the great northern barrier of the Carpathians. Often, when snow covers the northern mountain regions, the heat is considerable on the lowlands of the south, especially near the Maros. The climate of the great central plain resembles that of N. Italy; its sandy wastes, however, greatly contribute to the aridity of the summer winds. Blasts of wind and hail storms are not unfrequent in the Carpathians. The spring is the most agreeable season, but the autumn often partakes of the character of the Indian summer in the United States.—The fertility of the soil, with the exception of several mountainous and sandy regions, is almost extraordinary. Among the vegetable productions are: the different species of grain, especially wheat, which is equally abundant and excellent; maize, pulse, potatoes, cabbages, turnips, hemp, flax, rapeseed; exquisite melons, often of immense size, apples, pears, apricots, and plums; cherries, mulberries, chestnuts, filberts, and walnuts; tobacco, which is now monopolized by the crown; poppies cultivated for oil; wine of the most various kinds, including the delicious Tokay of the Hegyalja; almonds, figs, and olives, on the southern border; anise, Turkish pepper, sweet wood, safflower, madder, and other dye plants; numerous species of berries

in the greatest abundance; oaks, which yield large quantities of galls, the beech, fir, pine, ash, alder, and numerous other forest trees, often covering extensive tracts of land in the mountainous regions. Among the animals are the bear, wolf, lynx, wild cat, boar, chamois, marmot, deer, fox, hare; many fine breeds of horses and cattle (including buffaloes), dogs, sheep, and swine, the last of which are fattened in the forests on acorns. The birds comprise the golden and stone eagle, hawk, kite, bustard, heron, partridge, woodcock, nightingale, lark, and the common varieties of poultry in great abundance. Fish, bees, and leeches abound. Of minerals, there are gold, iron, and copper in large quantities; silver, zinc, lead, coal, cobalt, nitre, antimony, arsenic, sulphur, alum, soda, saltpetre, potassium, marble, crystal, chalk; salt in immense mines, especially in Mármaros; jasper, chalcedony, hyacinths, amethysts, agates, and beautiful varieties of opal (in Sáros). There are more than 300 mineral springs, of which those of Buda, Trentschin, Pöstény, Bartfeld, Parád, and Szobráncz are among the most renowned. The chief articles of export are wheat, rapeseed, galls, honey, wax, wine, tobacco, copper, alum, potash, wood, cattle, sheep, swine, hides, wool, dried fruits, and brandies, especially *slivovitza* or plum liquor. For imports and manufactures Hungary relies mainly on Austria, the chief home manufactures, beside the working of metals, being linen and woollens, leather, paper, pottery and clay pipes, soap and candles, and tobacco. The means of communication are still very scanty, good roads being rare, and only few of the principal rivers sufficiently improved for navigation. Steamers ply on the Danube and Theiss; a central railroad with various branches connects the capital and chief commercial city Buda-Pesth with Presburg, Debreczin, Szegedin, &c. The principal seats of learning are at Pesth, which is also the literary centre, Presburg, Kaschau, Debreczin, Patak, Pápa, Veszprém, Miskolcz, Szegedin, Stuhl-Weissenburg, and Grosswardein. The higher grades of education, especially classical, are better provided for than elementary instruction.—The variety of nationalities and languages rivals that of productions. There are Magyars or Hungarians proper, the predominant race (about 4,500,000 in the limited crownland), chiefly in the fertile regions of the centre and in the S. W.; Slovaks (1,800,000) in the mountain regions of the N. W. and N., Ruthenians (450,000) in those of the N. E., Rascians (Servians), Slavonians, and Illyrians (together 100,000) in the S., Croats and Wends (100,000) in the S. W., all of Slavic race; Wallachs (650,000) in the S. E.; Germans (1,000,000) and Jews (350,000), chiefly in the towns of all regions; gypsies (50,000), settled in towns and villages, or migratory; beside Szeklers (properly Székelys) or Magyar borderers, Armenians, French, Bulgarians, &c., in the detached provinces. These various elements are distinguished not only by language, but also by peculiar costumes, manners, and moral characteristics. The character

of the principal races is well defined by Mr. Emeric Szabad in a recent sketch of the statistics and history of his country: "The Magyars, both nobles and peasants, are marked by oriental pride and nobleness, by love of liberty, hospitable customs, conviviality, and warlike spirit. Clinging with filial affection to his superiors, the peasant—a gentleman in language and bearing—is, at the same time, alive to the sense of his own worth. In field labor and horsemanship, the Magyars surpass all the rest. The Slavi of N. W. Hungary are mild, frugal, and industrious. The Rascians are in character very much like the Greeks, being, moreover, merry, warlike, and of fierce disposition. The Croats partake more of the character of the Rascians than of that of the north-western Slavi; and as to the Germans, they preserve their usual traits of industry and peaceableness. The most neglected race is, perhaps, the Wallachs. Strongly resembling in physiognomy the Italians, a fact clearly verifying their intermixture with the Romans, they, like the Slavi, are bony, and of a tall stature, and are considered as one of the least active races." Of the inhabitants about 4,700,000 are Roman Catholics, 750,000 United Greeks, 550,000 non-united Greeks, 1,750,000 Calvinists (Reformed, popularly Hungarian church), 900,000 Lutherans, and 350,000 Jews.—Politically, Hungary proper was divided down to 1849 into 4 natural divisions or circles, called, from the standpoint of Pesth, the Cis-Danubian (N. and E. of the Danube), Trans-Danubian (S. and W. of the Danube), Cis-Tibiscan (N. and W. of the Theiss), and Trans-Tibiscan (S. and E. of the Theiss), and subdivided into counties. Since the accession of Francis Joseph, however, the crownland is divided into the 5 circles of Presburg, Oedenburg, Pesth, Kaschau, and Grosswardein, named after their capitals, the subdivisions being maintained with few alterations. The following table exhibits both the historical and present divisions:

| CIS-DANUBIAN CIRCLE. | | Counties. | Principal Towns. |
|----------------------|--------------|--|---|
| CIRCLE OF PRESBURG. | C. OF PESTH. | Presburg (<i>Pozsony</i>). | Presburg. |
| | | Neutra (<i>Nyitra</i>). | Neutra. |
| | | Trentschin (<i>Tren- csény</i>). | Trentschin. |
| | | Árva. | Kubin. |
| C. OF PESTH. | VOIVODINA. | Turóc. | Rosenberg (<i>Szent Márton</i>). |
| | | Bars. | Kremnitz (<i>Körmöcz</i>). |
| | | Liptó. | Szent Miklós. |
| | | Sohl (<i>Zólyom</i>). | Schemnitz (<i>Selmecz</i>). |
| C. OF PESTH. | VOIVODINA. | Hont. | Ipolyság. |
| | | Nógrád. | Losonez. |
| | | Pesth (<i>Pest</i>). | Buda-Pesth. |
| | | Gran (<i>Esztergom</i>). | Gran. |
| C. OF PESTH. | VOIVODINA. | Bács. | Zombor. |
| | | TRANS-DANUBIAN CIRCLE. | |
| | | Wieselburg (<i>Mosony</i>). | Altenburg (<i>Magyar Óvár</i>). |
| | | Oedenburg (<i>Soprony</i>). | Oedenburg. |
| CIRCLE OF OEDENBURG. | C. OF PESTH. | Eisenburg (<i>Vas</i>). | Güns (<i>Kőszeg</i>). |
| | | Zala. | Kanisa. |
| | | Somogy. | Kaposvár. |
| | | Baranya. | Fünf Kirehen (<i>Pécs</i>). |
| C. OF PESTH. | C. OF PESTH. | Tolna. | Szekszárd. |
| | | Veszprém. | Pápa. |
| | | Raab (<i>Győr</i>). | Raab. |
| | | Comorn (<i>Komárom</i>). | Comorn. |
| C. OF PESTH. | | Weissenburg (<i>Fejér</i>). | Stuhl-Weissenburg (<i>Székes Fejérvár</i>). |

| CIS-TIBISCAN CIRCLE. | | Counties. | Principal Towns. |
|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| CIRCLE OF KASCHAU. | C. OF PESTH. | Heves. | Erlau (<i>Eger</i>). |
| | | Borsod. | Miskolez. |
| | | Gömör. | Rosenau (<i>Rozsnyó</i>). |
| | | Zips (<i>Szepes</i>). | Leutsehan (<i>Lőcse</i>). |
| | | Sáros. | Eperies (<i>Eperjes</i>). |
| | | Torna. | Torna. |
| | | Abauj. | Kasschau (<i>Kassa</i>). |
| | | Zemplén. | Ujhely. |
| | | Ung. | Ugvár. |
| | | Bereg. | Munkács. |
| | | TRANS-TIBISCAN CIRCLE. | |
| CIRCLE OF GROSS-WARDEIN (<i>Nagy Vár</i>). | C. OF PESTH. | Ugoosa. | Nagy Szöllös. |
| | | Mármaros. | Sziget. |
| | | Szatmár. | Szatmár. |
| | | Szabolcs. | Nyiregyháza. |
| | | Bihar. | Debreczin (<i>Debreczen</i>). |
| | | Békes. | Gyula. |
| | | Arad. | Old Arad. |
| | | Csanád. | Makó. |
| | | Csongrád. | Szegedin (<i>Szeged</i>). |
| | | Torontál. | Beeskerek. |
| BANAT. | C. OF PESTH. | Temes. | Temesvár. |
| | | Krassó. | Lugos. |
| | | Middle Szolnok. | |
| REANNEX'D TO TRANSYLVANIA. | C. OF PESTH. | Kraszna. | } Annexed parts. |
| | | Zaránd. | |
| | | Kövár (region). | |

ENCLOSED DISTRICTS
(on both sides of the middle and lower Theiss).
Great and Little Cumania (*Kunság*).
Jazygia (*Jászság*).
Hayduk towns (*Hajdu-városok*).

—Among the nations who occupied parts of Hungary before its conquest by the Magyars or Hungarians, we find the Dacians, Bastarnæ, Illyrians, Pannonians, Sarmatians, Vandals, Bulgarians, Jazyges, Alans, Avars, Huns, Marcomanni, Gepidæ, Longobards, Goths, and Khazars. The Romans held the S. W. part of the country under the name of Pannonia, while the S. E. belonged to their province of Dacia. Various Slavic tribes, together with Wallachs, Bulgarians, and Germans, were the chief occupants at the time of the Magyar invasion. The Magyars, a warlike people of Turanian race, had made various migrations, and long dwelt in the vicinity of the Caucasian mountains, and afterward in the region between the Don and Dniester, before they approached and crossed the Carpathians (about 887) under the lead of Álmos, one of their 7 chiefs (*vezér*), and elected head (*fejedelem*) or duke. They were divided into 7 tribes and 108 families, had a compact, consecrated by oaths, which guaranteed justice and equality among themselves, and a religion which in various features resembled the Aryan element worship of the Medo-Persians, but also included the notion of a supreme Being (*Isten*; Gr. *εστι*, Lat. *est*, Heb. *yesh*, Germ. *ist*, Slavic *yest*, is). Árpád, the son of Álmos, conquered the whole of Hungary and Transylvania, organized the government, and also made various expeditions beyond the limits of these countries, among others against Svatopluk of Moravia, being invited by the emperor Arnulph. These expeditions were further extended under his son Zoltán (907–946) and grandson Taksony (946–972), spreading terror and devastation as far as the German ocean, the south of France and Italy, and the Black sea. But various bloody defeats, especially near Merseburg (933) by the emperor Henry I., on the Lech (955) by Otho I., and in Greece (970), finally broke the desire of the Hungarians for booty

and adventurous exploits, and turned the attention of their princes to the consolidation of their power within the natural limits of the country. Gejza (972-997), the son of Taksony, who married a Christian princess, promoted the spread of Christianity, which was begun by numerous slaves and priests from the west and south, and almost completed under his son Stephen I. (997-1038), whose religious zeal gained him a crown and the title of apostolic king from Pope Sylvester II. (1000), and afterward the appellation of saint. Assisted by Roman priests, German knights, and numerous monks, he proclaimed the freedom of Christian slaves, introduced Latin schools, established bishoprics, built churches, chapels, and convents, elevated the bishops to the foremost rank in the state, compelled the people to pay tithes to the new clergy, and subdued the rebellious adherents of the national religion. The political and administrative institutions of the state were also organized, receiving already at that early period the principal features of the recently abolished Hungarian constitution. The original equality of the conquerors was limited by imitations of the western feudal aristocracy, and their various relations to the subdued people caused the introduction of numerous lower divisions. The higher clergy, the higher nobility, consisting of distinguished national families and of foreign lords, and the common nobility, embracing the bulk of the national warriors, were the ruling classes; the two former, together with the dignitaries of the state, the palatine (*nádor*), the court judge (afterward land judge), &c., formed the senate, or the higher division of the legislative body. The chiefs of the royal castle-environs (*vár-megyé*), out of which the counties were afterward developed, were the principal executive officers of the king. Against this new order of things, which included a foreign religion, a foreign language, numerous foreign institutions, and the frequent intermeddling of foreigners, the national party more than once violently rose both under Stephen and his successors, Peter (1038-'46), against whom Aba Samuel was elected king, and who twice lost his throne, Andrew I. (1046-'61), who perished after being defeated by his brother Béla, and Béla I. (1061-'63), under whom the resistance of the defenders of the ancient religion was finally broken. The frequent bloody civil strifes were not only kept up by the undefined succession to the throne of the house of Árpád, but also fomented by the intervention of the popes and the emperors. The emperor Henry III. in the reign of Andrew repeatedly invaded the country. The son of the latter, Solomon, who succeeded his uncle (1063-'74), lost his throne chiefly in consequence of his ill treatment of his gallant cousins and successors Gejza (1074-'77) and Ladislas (1077-'95), to whom he owed his elevation, and some splendid victories over invaders; and he vainly applied for aid both to the emperor Henry IV. and his antagonist Pope Gregory VII., who each

claimed the rights of suzerainty over Hungary. He died in exile. Ladislas was equally brave and pious. He is a saint in the Roman calendar, and his victories over the Cumanians, who invaded Transylvania and the neighboring districts, and the conquest of Croatia and Halicz (eastern Galicia), made him one of the favorite princes of his nation. His nephew Coloman (1095-1114), surnamed the Scholar, was an enlightened and able ruler. He introduced various reforms, refused to accept the lead of the first crusade, closely watched the hosts which passed through his country, and routed or repulsed the more disorderly, though he received Godfrey of Bouillon as a friend. He annexed Dalmatia, but stained the close of his reign by cruelty toward his brother Álmos, who conspired against him. His son, the profligate Stephen II. (1114-'31), waged war against almost all his neighbors. Béla II., the Blind (1131-'41), the son of Álmos, and like his father the victim of Coloman, took bloody revenge on his former enemies on the occasion of the diet at Arad. Under his son Gejza II. (1141-'61) numerous Saxon colonies were settled in the Zips and Transylvania, while their countrymen who joined the second crusade desolated the regions through which they passed. The disputed rights to Galicia and Dalmatia, and the often changing relations with the Byzantine empire, were now sources of frequent wars in the north and south. Stephen III. (1161-'73), Gejza's youthful son, who overcame the intrigues of Manuel Comnenus and the opposition of two rivals, Ladislas II. and Stephen IV., but succumbed to poison, was succeeded by his brother Béla III. (1173-'96), who, having been educated at the Greek court, and supported by it, introduced various imitations of its administrative organization, and was successful in Galicia, as well as in Dalmatia against the republic of Venice. His connection with the West in consequence of his marriage with Margaret of France induced numerous noble youths to visit the chief cities and schools of France, England, and Italy. His son Emeric (1196-1205) was tormented by the revolts of his brother Andrew, and in vain had his son Ladislas III. crowned before his death. Andrew II. (1205-'35) was successively under the influence of his unscrupulous wife, who finally was assassinated; of the pope, who compelled him to undertake a crusade; of his financiers, Christian, Saracen, and Jewish, who monopolized the revenues of the impoverished kingdom; of the nobility, who in 1222 extorted from him the "golden bull," a Hungarian "Magna Charta" of freedom and privileges, including the right of armed resistance to tyranny; and finally of a combined violent opposition, to which belonged his son and successor Béla (IV.). The long reign of the latter (1235-'70) commenced with salutary reforms, but was afterward disturbed by the immigration of the Cumanians and the invasion of the Tartars, who annihilated the Hungarian army on the Sajó (1241), and marked their way from the Carpathians to the Adriatic

by sword and fire, famine and pestilence. Béla did his best to restore order and repopulate the country by new immigrants, bestowed various rights on the cities, and promoted the culture of the vine; but his wars with Austria, Styria, &c., and the revolts of his son Stephen, destroyed order, and promoted only the usurpations of the high nobility. Stephen V. (1270-'72) was successful against Ottokar of Bohemia. His son Ladislas IV. (1272-'90), who succeeded at the age of 10, caused violent commotions and endless misery by his Cumanian amours and predilections, and was murdered at the instigation of one of his mistresses. A nephew of Béla IV., Andrew III. (1290-1301), was the last of the Árpáds, and after a disturbed reign, which various diets held on the plain of Rákos near Pesth could not consolidate, died probably by poison. The throne was now open for competition, and the royal dignity became purely elective. Charles Robert of Anjou, a nephew of the king of Naples, and by his mother a descendant of the extinct dynasty, being supported by the see of Rome, was the first elected; while another party, the leader of which was the powerful count Matthias Csák, successively elected Wenceslas, son of the king of Bohemia (1301-'5), and Otho of Bavaria (1305-'8), both of whom were by a similar title descendants of the Árpáds. Charles Robert's reign (1309-'42) was marked by great successes at home and abroad. The regal power was extended and consolidated chiefly by a new military and financial organization; western refinement and luxury made the Hungarian lords more docile, and the succession to the thrones of Poland and Naples was secured to the two sons of the king, Louis and Andrew. Visegrád, however, which replaced Stuhl-Weissenburg as the royal residence, witnessed many a princely crime. Buda became a still more splendid residence under Louis, surnamed the Great (1342-'82), who further developed the regal power, but with it the oppressive feudal institutions; and excepting his repeated expeditions to Italy to revenge the assassination of his brother Andrew by his own wife, Johanna, was successful in all his undertakings, conquering among other territories Moldavia and Bulgaria, and after the death of his uncle Casimir the Great of Poland, the last of the Piasts (1370), having the Adriatic, the Black sea, and the Baltic as boundaries of his states. He was chivalrous, luxurious, and bigoted; he promoted commerce, but burdened the peasants, persecuted the Cumanian pagans, and expelled the Jews, whom, however, his son-in-law Sigismund of Luxemburg brought back into the country. This prince having liberated his wife Mary, who had got rid of a rival, the Neapolitan Charles the Little, by assassination, but subsequently lost her throne and freedom, reigned together with her (1387-'95), and after her death alone (1395-1437), being also elected German emperor, and succeeding to the throne of his house in Bohemia. His long reign was full of evil strife, including the Hussite war in Bohemia, a revolt in Hungary,

which for a short time deprived him of his liberty, and a rising of the peasants in Transylvania, and of wars against Venice and the Turks, who under Bajazet routed him in the battle of Nicopolis; but it was also marked by some salutary reforms in favor of the lower classes. Sigismund was succeeded by his son-in-law, the emperor Albert (II.) of Hapsburg (1437-'9), who soon died after an unsuccessful campaign against Sultan Amurath, leaving his thrones to his pregnant wife Elizabeth. Unable to defend them, Sigismund's daughter now offered her hand to Ladislas III. of Poland, the crown of which country had been given with the hand of Hedvig, the younger daughter of Louis the Great, to Jagiello of Lithuania, the father of Ladislas. The young Polish king after some struggle became also king of Hungary under the name of Uladislav I. (Polish *Władysław*, Hung. *Ulászló*, not *László*, Ladislas), but after several glorious victories of his great general John Hunyady over the Turks, fell in the bloody battle of Varna (1444), having broken his oath of peace to the infidels. Ladislas (V.), the posthumous child of Albert, whom his mother Elizabeth, shortly before her death, had carried together with the crown to her brother-in-law, the emperor Frederic III., was now acknowledged as king (1445-'57), the heroic Hunyady being appointed governor or regent (1446-'53). Frederic of Hapsburg, however, had to be compelled to restore the prince; powerful lords, Giskra in the N. W., Ulric of Cille in the S. W., Ujlaky, Garay, and others, caused endless disturbances, and the Turks menaced Hungary, while preparing to strike the last blow at the Byzantine empire. Hunyady himself was defeated, but made good his escape, and died victorious, having repulsed Mohammed II., the conqueror of Constantinople, from the walls of Belgrade (1456). Of his two sons, Ladislas was treacherously imprisoned and executed by command of the ungrateful and weak king, but Matthias, surnamed Corvinus, ascended the throne after the death of the latter and a protracted election struggle. The ablest monarch of Hungary (1458-'90), he humiliated its enemies at home and abroad, subduing the rebellious lords, and alternately vanquishing in numerous campaigns the emperor, Podiebrad of Bohemia, and the armies of Mohammed II. He restored order, law, and prosperity, promoted science and art more than any other prince of his age, and administered his kingdom with an impartiality the glory of which survived him in the popular adage: "King Matthias is dead, justice gone." Not only justice, but also the might, prosperity, and splendor of the country were gone with Matthias; the flourishing schools decayed, the scientific collections were scattered. The indolent Uladislav (II.) of Bohemia (1490-1516) was as poor as he was contemptible, and let his lords do as they chose. Of these John Zápolya, waywode of Transylvania, suppressed with dreadful bloodshed a great insurrection of the peasantry under Dózsa (1514). Under the young

and weak son of Uladislas, Louis II. (1516-'26), the country gradually ripened for a catastrophe. While the nobles disputed, Belgrade fell, and finally the battle of Mohács was rashly fought against Sultan Solyman the Magnificent. The Hungarian army was destroyed, Louis perished on his flight, and his wife, the sister of Ferdinand of Austria, hastened to carry the crown to her brother. This prince inaugurated the still reigning dynasty of the Hapsburgs, being acknowledged as king (1526-'64) by the nobility of the western counties, while the national party elected John Zápolya (1526-'40), who prevailed in Transylvania and the adjoining parts. The latter put himself under the protection of Solyman, who took Buda and even besieged Vienna (1529). Long campaigns and negotiations and short-lived treaties now followed each other, the final result of which was that Hungary was for about 150 years divided into 3 parts with often changing limits, under the Hapsburgs as kings, each of whom swore allegiance to the constitution, and none of whom kept his oath, the pashas of the sultans, who often made conquering or predatory expeditions, and the princes of Transylvania, who, though under the vassalage of the sultans, became the champions of Hungarian nationality, religious liberty, and Protestantism. The greater part of Hungary proper, however, including the whole N. W., was in the hands of the royal or imperial armies, the monarchs holding also the crown of Germany after the abdication of Charles V., and finding many a hero among their Hungarian subjects. Thus during the war with the Turks in 1552 Losonezy immortalized himself by the defence of Temesvár, Szondy by that of Drégely, Dobó by that of Erlau. Maximilian (1564-'76) was saved by the self-sacrificing heroism of Zrinyi, who fell with his little fortress Sziget and the last of his men only after the death of the besieger Solyman and the destruction of a part of his army (1566). All these services of the magnates, as well as of the nation, were repaid with ingratitude by the Austrian dynasty. The diets of Hungary, which for centuries remained the blood-covered bulwark of Christendom, more than once had to complain that the imperial soldiery did more to devastate the country and famish the people than the infidel conquerors. Rudolph I. (1576-1608) commenced the persecution of the Protestants. These, however, not only had a free home in Transylvania under the enlightened Stephen Báthori, afterward king of Poland (who had succeeded the younger Zápolya), but also a protector of their rights in Hungary in Bocskay, the Transylvanian successor of Sigismund Báthori, who suddenly raised the banner of freedom, sweeping all over the north, crushing the generals of Rudolph, and finally compelling the latter to the humiliating peace of Vienna (1606). The old emperor finally resigned his Hungarian crown to his brother Matthias (II.), whose tolerant reign, however, was too short for the pacification of the country

(1608-'19). His successor Ferdinand II. (1619-'37), who commenced his bloody reign amid the first flames of the 30 years' war, was prevented from tearing the Hungarian charter of liberty, as he did the Bohemian, by the rekindled spirit of the nation and the victories of the Transylvanian prince Gabriel Bethlen, the successor of the profligate tyrant Gabriel Bathori, who soon compelled him to the treaty of Nikolsburg (1622), which again sanctioned the rights of the Protestants. A similar treaty was concluded by Ferdinand III. (1637-'57) with George I. Rákóczy of Transylvania at Linz (1645). Leopold I. (1657-1705), whose long reign in Hungary was but a series of wars, insurrections, and executions, found a less able opponent in the ambitious George II. Rákóczy of Transylvania, and excellent generals against the Turks in Montecuculi, who gained the battle of St. Gothard (1664), and Nicholas Zrinyi (the poet), but made an ignominious peace with the sultan, and had the distinguished leaders of a national conspiracy, Peter Zrinyi, Frangepan, and Nádasdy, executed in Austria (1671), and his minister Lobkowitz sent against the insurgents of the northern counties the bloodthirsty foreigners Spankau, Kobb, Caraffa, and Strasoldo. The people rose again "for God and freedom" under Tökölyi (1678), who, being allied with Apafi of Transylvania, the Porte, and Louis XIV. of France, was near uniting the whole of Hungary under his banner, when the reverses of the Turks before Vienna (1683), where John Sobieski of Poland saved the throne of the imbecile emperor, at Párkány and Gran, the conquest of Buda (1686) after a memorable siege under Louis of Baden and Maximilian of Bavaria, who were assisted by the choicest Christian warriors from various countries, and the subsequent victories of the imperialists, sealed the fate of the insurrection. Caraffa made the scaffold permanent in Eperies; the diet of Presburg had to consent to the demands of the emperor in making the throne hereditary in the house of Austria and abrogating the clause of the golden bull which guaranteed the right of resistance to oppression (1687); Prince Eugene completed the victories over the Turks, and conquered the peace of Carlovitz (1699); Transylvania was occupied, and Tökölyi, who tried in vain to recover it, died in exile in Asia Minor. His heroic wife, the daughter of the executed Zrinyi, had been compelled to surrender her long defended fortress Munkács. Hungary was now a province of Austria, and treated as such, when the noble-hearted Francis Rákóczy, who had long lived in exile, suddenly appeared on the N. E. borders (1703), and renewed the struggle for religious and civil liberty. Protestants and Catholics flocked to his banners, which were triumphantly carried into the very vicinity of Vienna, when the emperor died. His son Joseph I. (1705-'11) was inclined to peace, and Rákóczy was not opposed to it, though assisted by Louis XIV. and the perplexities of the new emperor in the war of Spanish succession.

Diets and negotiations followed each other, but without success, while the victories of Eugene and Marlborough and violent dissensions in the camp of the insurgents enabled the emperor to restore the fortunes of the war in Hungary. In the absence of Rákóczy, who after various defeats had gone to Poland to procure the alliance of the czar Peter, now victorious over Charles XII., a peace was finally concluded at Szatmár (1711) by Károlyi and other leaders of the insurgents, with the patriotic count Pálffy, who acted in the name of the emperor. The latter, who promised toleration and a strict observance of the constitution, had died in the meanwhile, and his successor Charles (VI. as emperor, III. as king, 1711-'40) ratified the treaty, while Rákóczy absolved his followers from their oath of allegiance to him. The new emperor's favorite scheme, the pragmatic sanction, which was to secure the succession of the female line to all his possessions, was agreed to by the diet of 1722, which also enacted various other important laws. The peace of Passarowitz (1718), the result of Eugene's new victories, enlarged the kingdom with the Banat, the last province of the Turks in Hungary; but after another war Belgrade was ceded to the Turks by the treaty concluded in that city in 1739. Charles's mild reign disposed the nation to defend the disputed rights of his daughter Maria Theresa (1740-'80), who appeared in person before the diet of Presburg, and was greeted with lively acclamations by the chivalric nobles. Their *Moriamur pro rege nostro Maria Theresa* was no vain promise, for Hungarian blood was shed profusely in her wars against Frederic the Great and other enemies. She rewarded the fidelity of the people by mildness, and various ameliorations of the condition of the peasantry (the *Urbarium*) are among the merits of her reign; but she too was far from strictly observing the constitution, which her son Joseph II. (1780-'90), in his immoderate zeal for reforms and centralization, was eager to destroy. To avoid binding himself by the constitutional oath, he refused to be crowned in Hungary, autocratically dictated his liberal reforms, and imposed upon the country foreign officials, a foreign language, the German, and foreign official costumes. But his violent though well meant measures were opposed everywhere, and the rising in his Belgic provinces, the unfavorable issue of his war against Turkey, and finally the threatening events in France, compelled the philanthropic despot to revoke his decrees shortly before his death. His mild and dissolute brother Leopold II. (1790-'92), afraid of the growing storm in the West, hastened to appease the Hungarian nation, which had been aroused by ignominious treatment and the spectacle of its perishing neighbor Poland to a general desire of national regeneration. The diet of 1791 again sanctioned the most essential constitutional rights of the kingdom in general, and of the Protestants in particular, and for a series of years Francis, the son and successor of Leopold (1792-1835), was satisfied

during his long wars against republican and imperial France with the continual subsidies of Hungary in money and men, including the husars, whom even Napoleon acknowledged to be the bravest in the ranks of his enemies. The rare manifestations of democratic convictions he stifled in the dungeons of his fortresses, or, as in the case of the priest Martinovics (1795), in the blood of the offenders. The magnates were flattered and remained faithful. Thus Napoleon in vain called upon the Hungarians to rise for national independence. The last "general rising" of the nobility was the answer (1809), but proved at the same time how incapable the old spirit was of being revived. Scarcely, however, had the dangers passed which so long threatened the crowns of Francis, when his minister Metternich made it one of his principal tasks for the restoration of the shaken and bankrupt Austrian empire to undermine the constitution of Hungary, the only check on the unlimited sway of the rulers. Every means, secret or open, was resorted to, but in vain. The progress of enlightenment, the warning example of Galicia, that withering limb of Poland torn from its body by Austria, and the spirit of nationality, rekindled by the activity of Francis Kazinczy and others, had prepared the nation for a struggle for constitutionalism and liberal reforms, which Metternich, both under Francis and his imbecile son Ferdinand V. (I. as emperor of Austria, 1835-'48), was unable effectively to resist. The Hungarian constitution had during the last few centuries undergone numerous modifications, without having at any period of its existence lost its vitality. As it was now, it was at the same time a charter of freedom, which shielded the people at large against the tyrannical sway of the princes and their ministers, against oppressive taxes and levies, and especially the Protestants and Jews against the proscriptive system which prevailed in Austria, and secured to the numerous nobility the greatest degree of personal liberty and immunity enjoyed by any class in Europe, and on the other hand an instrument of oppression in the hands of the nobility against all plebeian inhabitants of the country, especially the peasantry, which was degraded by numerous feudal burdens. The nobles were free from every tax and personal service, except in case of a hostile attack on the country itself, when they were obliged to rise in a body at their own expense; they enjoyed all the privileges of the right of *habeas corpus*, governed the counties by their regular assemblies ("congregations") and court sessions, electing the vice-counts, administrative judges, court assessors, &c., and exercised the right of legislation by their deputies to the lower house of the diet, two from each county, who in important questions were bound by the instructions of their constituents. The higher nobility, or magnates, dukes, counts, and barons, together with the chief dignitaries of the crown, the Catholic and Greek bishops and some other prelates, and the county presidents or lord lieutenants, formed

the upper house of the diet under the presidency of the palatine. The absent magnates were represented in the lower house by proxies, who, however, like some other minor members, had only a deliberative vote; while the deputies of all free royal towns, which had their own separate domestic administration, could cast only one decisive vote. The diet, which in the earliest times had been held at Stuhl-Weissenburg or on the plain of Rákos before Pesth, and during the Turkish and civil wars in various cities, was now regularly convoked by the monarch at Presburg, at intervals not exceeding 3 years. Its duration was unlimited. Beside general legislation, it voted the various non-domestic contributions of the country, the refusal of which was the most effective weapon against the Vienna government. The concurrence of both houses and the royal sanction were necessary for all enactments. The chief royal organs of general administration were the Hungarian aulic chancery at Vienna, and the royal council at Buda, whose decisions, however, very often met with opposition or delay in the county assemblies. This *vis inertiae* of the latter was the principal check on all despotic or unconstitutional attempts of the ministers, while their publicity and jealously guarded freedom of debate were the chief elements of progress and political enlightenment. Gradually to abolish the immunities of the nobles and the feudal burdens of the peasantry, to endow the great bulk of the people with political rights, and at the same time to fortify the old bulwarks of the constitution, now became the task of the patriots; and the great movement offered the rare spectacle of an aristocracy contending for the abolition of privileges and the equality of the people. Paul Nagy and Count Stephen Széchényi were the champions of nationality at the diet of 1825, which inaugurated a long period of moderate but gradual reforms, the most important of which were carried through at the diets of 1832-'6, 1839-'40, and 1843-'4. The rights of the non-noble citizens, peasantry, and Jews, the equality of the Christian confessions, the official use of the Hungarian language, and the freedom of speech were extended, the majority of the educated lower nobility and a minority of the higher ardently contending against old abuses and aristocratic immunities, against bureaucratic despotism and religious intolerance. Among the chief leaders of the "liberal opposition" under Ferdinand were the members of the upper house Count Louis Batthyányi, Count Zay, and Baron Eötvös; the deputies Deák of Zala, Bezerédy of Tolna, Beöthy of Bihar, Klauzál of Csongrád, Palóczy and Szemere of Borsod, Szentkirályi and Ráday of Pesth, Balogh of Bars, and Kubinyi of Nógrád; the great Transylvanian agitator Baron Wesselényi, and the publicist Kossuth. The cabinet of Vienna chose the last five as its victims, prosecuting them for treason, and imprisoning Wesselényi and Kossuth for years. The old palatine Joseph, the uncle of the emperor, and the conservatives under the lead of

Counts Aurel and Emil Dessewffy, as well as of the moderate Széchényi, in vain strove to check the agitation. It reached its culminating point when Kossuth, after a lively struggle, was elected as representative of Pesth to the diet of 1847. Europe was agitated; the last rising of Poland (1846) had been suppressed by a massacre of the nobles in Galicia, and the republic of Cracow annihilated; the Swiss confederation was convulsed by a civil war; Pius IX. had given the signal for constitutional movements in Italy; Sardinia was arming against Austria, and France preparing for a new struggle. Kossuth proposed extensive reforms, and was ardently supported by the house of deputies and the nation. A conflict with the government seemed imminent, when the general shock which followed the French revolution of February overthrew the rule of Metternich (March 13, 1848). Kossuth was greeted as liberator by the people of Vienna, and together with L. Batthyányi intrusted with the formation of an independent Hungarian ministry by Ferdinand. The people of Pesth, under the lead of the youthful poet Petöfi, delivered in triumph the plebeian martyr for freedom Stancsics, proclaimed the liberty of the press, and the radical "wishes of the nation" (March 15). The new ministry embraced its favorites; Batthyányi was president, Kossuth was minister of finance, Széchényi of public works, Deák of justice, Eötvös of public worship and education, Szemere of home affairs, Klauzál of commerce, and Mészáros of war, beside Prince Paul Esterházy as *quasi* minister of foreign affairs in Vienna. Having enacted the abolition of feudalism, a new election law, and various other radical changes in the constitution, the last diet of Presburg dissolved, the new national assembly being appointed to meet in July at Pesth. The national government, however, whose animating spirit was Kossuth, was from the beginning surrounded by open and secret enemies, and endless difficulties and embarrassments. The cabinet of Vienna commenced its intrigues against the new order of things on the very day when it sanctioned it. Jellachich and others were sent openly or secretly to organize an insurrection of the southern Slavic tribes, which had long been worked upon by a three-fold national agitation, by the tools of the Austrian government against the Magyars, by popular enthusiasts in the interest of a democratic Pan-Slavic union, and by Russian emissaries in the interest of a similar union under the rule of the czar. Secret agents prepared a rising of the Wallachs in Transylvania, the diet of which proclaimed its reunion with Hungary. Dangerous tumults broke out in various German cities and among the Slovaks of the Waag. The fortresses and the foreign soldiery in the country were commanded by Austrian officers, and the Hungarian regiments were retained in Italy and Galicia. There were no national finances, no arms nor arm founderies. Every new measure met with opposition or delay through the

Vienna government or its tools. Negotiations had no result. The whole south of the country was soon in a flame. The Rascians rose in the Military Frontier, in the Banat and Bács, and the Wallachs in Transylvania, the Saxons also declaring for Austria; Croatia and Slavonia proclaimed their independence of Hungary, and Ban Jellachich occupied the Littorale, and threatened to cross the Drave. Against all these contingencies the only resource of the government was its own zeal and the enthusiasm of the people. Volunteer troops (honvéds, defenders of the land) were raised in the counties, rich contributions toward a national treasury were collected, and the militia was organized. The diet assembled in July, and voted extensive levies and ample means for defence, but Ferdinand refused to sanction its resolutions. The Austrian troops which were still sent against the insurgents were led by traitors. Even Mészáros was repulsed from Szent Tamás by the Rascians in August; the new troops were slowly gathering. Jellachich finally crossed the Drave, and the Vienna government, having reconquered Lombardy, threw off its mask in September, and sent Count Lamberg to disperse the diet by force. The Batthyányi ministry now resigned, and a committee of defence was formed under the presidency of Kossuth. The revolution began. The old troops were transformed and blended with the new. Kossuth's ardent eloquence brought the people of the central plain under arms. Single detachments of Hungarian troops returned with or without their officers from abroad. Comorn was secured. Archduke Stephen, the new palatine, fled from the country. Lamberg was massacred on the bridge of Pesth by a mob. Jellachich was defeated at Pákozd near Buda by the motley national army under Móga (Sept. 29) and fled toward Vienna, which rose in revolution (Oct. 6). Perczel and Görgey surrounded and disarmed at Ozora the isolated Croatian corps under Roth and Philippovics (Oct. 7). The fortresses, Comorn, Eszék, Peterwardein, Leopoldstadt, and Munkács, hoisted the national flag. On the other hand, Rukavina in Temesvár and Berger in Arad hoisted that of Austria, and made common cause with the Rascians, who committed frightful massacres. The war of races raged with terrible fury and varying success. Transylvania was entirely lost. The pursuit of Jellachich was executed with hesitation by Móga, a late Austrian general, the frontier river Leitha was crossed too late, and the hastily collected volunteers fled after a short fight at Schwechat (Oct. 30) against Windischgrätz and Jellachich, who thus became masters of Vienna. Katona, sent to reconquer Transylvania, was routed at Dées (Nov.). The Polish volunteers under Wysocki made unsuccessful attempts to capture Arad. Count Schlick entered Hungary from the north, dispersed the Hungarian militia on the mountain before Kaschau, and occupied that city (Dec. 11). The Rascian Damjanics alone led his valiant honvéds

to victory at Lagerndorf (Nov. 9), and Alibunár (Dec. 17) on the S. E. frontier, while Perczel successfully defended the line of the Drave on the S. W. Unable to defend the W. frontier against Windischgrätz, Simunich, and Nugent, Görgey, the new commander of the army of the upper Danube, retreated on the right bank of that river, evacuating Presburg, Raab, and after the rout of the equally retreating Perczel at Moor (Dec. 29), and the engagement at Tétény (Jan. 3, 1849), the capital Buda-Pesth itself (Jan. 5). The day before, Schlick dispersed the undisciplined army of the north under Mészáros, the minister of war. Thus the government and diet, which transferred their seat to Debreczin, would have had little prospect of security if the Polish general Bem had not begun in the latter half of December a new Transylvanian campaign, which cheered the patriots with a nearly unbroken series of signal successes over the imperialists under Urban and Puchner. Görgey, too, who according to a new plan of operations returned westward on the left bank of the Danube, leaving a part of his troops with Perczel on the middle Theiss, succeeded in diverting the Austrian main army under Windischgrätz from a march toward the latter river, though not in rescuing Leopoldstadt, which surrendered. Then turning northward, he skilfully fought his way through the rugged region of the ore mountains, amid continual perils, and, after a signal victory of his vanguard under Guyon, who had already proved his heroism in many a previous battle, over Schlick's corps on Mount Branyiszkó (Feb. 5), finally effected a junction with the army of the upper Theiss, which under Klapka had been successful against that Austrian general (Jan. 22, 23, and 31). Damjanics was recalled with his troops from the south, Perczel defended the middle Theiss, and Asztalos repulsed the Rascians on the Maros (Feb. 10). The activity of Kossuth and his associates in supplying all these bodies of troops with men, ammunition, money, and officers, while almost all parts of the country were alternately crossed by imperial and national armies, was admirable. The zeal of the committee of defence, however, was worthily responded to by the confidence of the people, who, even when two thirds of the country were in the hands of the enemy, almost as willingly accepted "Kossuth's bills" as specie, and by the general bravery of the troops, old and new, hussars, honvéds, and artillerymen. Order reigned in the midst of war; the prisons were empty. But new dangers arose with the invasion of the Russians from the Danubian principalities into Transylvania, where Bem, after a triumphant march (January) was suddenly checked before Hermannstadt, repulsed, threatened in the rear by Saxons, Wallachs, and the garrison of Carlsburg, and could save his position at Piski (Feb. 9, 10) only after the loss of a part of his heroic troops; and within the national camp by the stubborn disobedience and intrigues of Görgey, almost bordering on trea-

son, which caused the escape of Schlick from Kaschau, the unfavorable issue of the great battle of Kápolna (Feb. 26, 27), the retreat of the united main army beyond the Theiss, the deposition of its commander, the Pole Dembinski, at Fűred, and a considerable loss of time. Another heavy loss was that of the isolated fortress Eszék, which was surrendered with immense stores by its cowardly commanders. Elated by the despatches of Prince Windischgrätz, the young emperor Francis Joseph, who had succeeded his uncle at Olmütz (Dec. 2, 1848), now promulgated a new constitution (March 4), which with one stroke annihilated the constitution and national independence of Hungary, making it, with narrowed limits, a crownland of Austria. But the next few days brought a new series of Hungarian victories. Crossing the Theiss in the night, Damjanics surprised and totally routed the Austrians at Szolnok (March 5). Bem by a sudden assault took Hermannstadt (11th), and on the anniversary of the "day of Pesth" (15th) drove the Russians and Puelner through the Red Tower pass into Wallachia. After the occupation of Cronstadt (20th), all Transylvania, except Carlsburg, was in the hands of the Polish general, under whom Magyars and Szeklers, Poles and Viennese students fought with equal bravery. Perczel swept over the Rascian Vendée, and stormed the ramparts of Sz. Tamás (March, April). The temporary chief commander of the main army, Vetter, having fallen ill, Görgey finally received the command, and the offensive against Windischgrätz was resumed. Commanded under him by Damjanics, Klapka, Aulich, Wysocki, &c., the army crossed the Theiss at various points, and, advancing toward the capital, defeated the enemy at Hatvan (April 2), Bicske (4th), and Izsa-szeg (6th), and, leaving a corps under Aulich before Pesth to cover the main body, suddenly turned toward Waitzen, took it by assault (10th), routed the Austrians at Nagy Sarló (19th), rescued Comorn, which had withstood a long siege and bombardment, and crossing the Danube, gained a victory at Ács (26th). Schlick, Windischgrätz, Jellachich, Götze, who fell at Waitzen, Wohlgemuth, and Welden were thus successively defeated in this short campaign, during which the diet at Debreczin proclaimed the independence of the country (April 14), appointing Kossuth its governor, and Aulich entered Pesth. Benyiezky and a younger brother of Görgey cleared the mountain region of the N. W. Instead, however, of continuing his victorious march to the capital of the enemy, Görgey returned with the bulk of his army to the siege of Buda, which had been strongly fortified and was strenuously defended under Henzi, while a new and extensive Russian invasion was approaching. Buda was finally stormed (May 21), Henzi being mortally wounded, the government and diet returned to the capital, and Görgey again took the field; but, bent on intrigues against Kossuth, the new presiding minister Szémere, Dembinski, who commanded in the north, and

his own generals, he chose the N. bank of the Danube for his new campaign, which suited his political schemes, and, without profiting by Kmetty's victory at Csorna, S. of that river (June 13), wasted the blood of his army on the Waag. The Russian armies and fresh Austrian troops under Haynau were in the meanwhile pouring into the country from various quarters. Wysocki, the successor of Dembinski in command, retreated before Paskevitch; Temesvár was unsuccessfully besieged by Vécsey; Bem was paralyzed by a new and more terrible rising of the Wallachs, while his province, too, was invaded by the Russians. After various unsuccessful struggles on the line of the Waag (June 16, 17, 20, 21), the loss of Raab, (28th), and the great battle of Szöny (July 2), Görgey, leaving Klapka in Comorn, finally retreated toward the middle Theiss; but after a bloody fight against Paskevitch at Waitzen (15th), he turned northward, again and again repulsing the Russians, and crossed the Theiss at Tokaj. The Russians crossed it at Fűred, while the central Hungarian forces under the chief command of Dembinski retreated toward Szegedin, where they were joined by Guyon, who had routed Jellachich at Kis Hegyes (14th). The government leaving the former place, where the last session of the diet had been held, retired to Arad, which, having recently surrendered, was made the last point of general concentration, after the rout of Bem at Schäßburg by the Russians under Lüders (29th), of one of Görgey's divisions under Nagy-Sándor before Debreczin by the army of Paskevitch (Aug. 2), and of Dembinski at Szöreg by Haynau (5th). Dembinski, however, retreated toward Temesvár, where his army suffered a terrible defeat (9th). Görgey, who now arrived at Arad, summoned Kossuth to resign, and received from him the supreme civil and military command (11th), Klapka's sally from Comorn and signal victory over the besieging Austrian army (3d) being unknown at Arad. Two days later Görgey surrendered his army at discretion to the generals of the czar at Világos (13th). Damjanics followed his example, and surrendered Arad (17th). Kossuth, the late ministers Szémere and Casimir Batthyányi, the generals Bem, Dembinski, Mészáros, Vetter, Perczel, Guyon, Kmetty, Wysocki, and others, fled into Turkey. Munkács, Peterwardein, and Comorn capitulated. But scarcely had the tricolor disappeared from the ramparts of the last named fortress (Oct. 4), when the work of revenge commenced on the side of the victors. Count Louis Batthyányi, who had been made captive on a mission of peaceful mediation, was executed at Pesth (6th), and the generals Kis, Aulich, Damjanics, Nagy-Sándor, Török, Lahner, Vécsey, Knézi, Pölteberg, Leiningen, Schweidel, Dessewffy, and Lázár, all of whom had surrendered at discretion, were executed on the same day at Arad. The old president of the upper house at Debreczin, Baron Perényi, Szacs vay, Csernyus, Giron,

Abancourt, the young Polish prince Woroniecki, the revolutionary minister Csányi, and Baron Jessenák were executed at Pesth a few days later, like most of the preceding, on the gallows. Col. Kazinczy was shot at Arad. Other executions followed. The dungeons of the empire were filled with prisoners for life or a long term of years, including priests, officers, and government officials of every confession, rank, and age. Görgey was confined at Klagenfurth. The remnants of the Hungarian troops were impressed into the Austrian army, and the estates of the rich patriots confiscated. The country remained under martial law, receiving new divisions, authorities, and tax regulations, and foreign officials. The German was made the language of the reorganized higher courts, offices, and schools. New contributions, military levies, and so called voluntary loans, followed each other. A conspiracy and an attempt on the emperor's life led to the resumption of wholesale executions in 1853, among the more distinguished victims being Libényi, Jubal, Sárközi, Andrásfi, and Noszlopi. The Protestants and Jews were subjected to particular restrictions. Thus in spite of various scanty amnesties, and two journeys of the emperor through the country, the feelings of the nation remained hostile to Austria, and the attack on the latter by France and Sardinia in the spring of 1859 became the signal for national agitations abroad (under Kossuth, Count Ladislas Teleky, Klapka, and others) as well as at home, which, after the sudden discomfiture of all sanguine hopes by the agreement of Villafranca, concentrated themselves in a moderate but steady opposition to the new religious, financial, and municipal measures of the Vienna ministry, chiefly under the lead of the "old conservatives," and in peaceful but general demonstrations of the people. Of the latter the centennial celebration of the birthday of Francis Kazinczy (Oct. 27, 1859), in commemoration of his literary activity, his martyrdom for freedom being understood, was the most significant. Soon after numerous arrests took place throughout the country, and the 5th Austrian army corps was recalled from Italy to be placed at the disposal of the governor, Archduke Albert (Dec. 1859).

HUNGARY, LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF. The Hungarian language (Hung. *Magyar nyelv*) is an isolated branch of the Altaic, or Uralo-Altaic, or Tartaro-Finnic family, constituting a peculiar group with the now extinct idioms of the Uzes, Khazars, Petchenegs, and ancient Bulgarians. Leo Diaconus (10th century) called the Magyars Huns, and the people liked to consider themselves as such, being proud of Etele (Attila) and his brother Buda. The chronicle of the monastery of St. Wandrill and Dankovszki connect them both with the Huns and Avars; but De Guignes senior distinguishes them from the Huns, who were of Mongolian race. Some connect the Hungarians with both the Ugurs or Ighurs and the westerly Ogors, Ugurs, or Jugri. Both theories, based on the similarity of sounds,

are less probable than that which derives Ungar from *Ung-vár*, castle on the river Ung. There are also various derivations of the name Magyar from roots belonging to the Hungarian language, as *Mej-erő*, breast-strength, and *Mag-gyar*, seed-maker, agriculturist; but none of these is generally adopted by scholars. The Byzantine emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus (905-959) names the people *Turkoi*. The Magyars and the Osmanlis agree in the belief that they are kindred, and the former are called "bad brothers" by the latter for having resisted them. Spittler contends that the Magyars are Calmucks. The Franciscan Du Plan de Carpin (1246) calls Bashkiria *Magna Hungaria*, and the Minorite Ruysbroek (1253) says that the Bashkir and Hungarian languages agree. Sajnovich (*Demonstratio Ungarorum et Lapponum Idioma idem esse*, Copenhagen, 1770, and "Memoirs of the Danish Academy," t. x.), Ihre Oehr (*De Convenientia Linguae Lapponicæ cum Hungaricæ*, Upsal, 1777), Sam. Gyarmathy (*Affinitas Linguae Hungaricæ cum Linguis Fennicæ Originis grammaticè demonstrata*, Göttingen, 1799), Eccard, Hell, Gatterer, Schlözer, Büsching, Hager, &c., support the Finno-Estho-Lapponic affinity; while Oertelius (*Harmonia Linguarum, speciatim Hungaricæ cum Hebrææ*, Wittenberg, 1746), Paul Beregszászy (*Ueber die Aehnlichkeit der ungarischen Sprache mit den morgenländischen, &c.*, Leipsic, 1796), Otrokotsi, Kalmár, Verseggy, &c., contend for a Semitic pedigree of the Magyar language. Klaproth deduces it from a mixture of Tartaric or Turkish with Finnic. Malte-Brun considers the Magyars as Finns who were subjected to the Turks and to an unknown Uralian people. J. K. Bese found that the Karatchai and Bizinghi, Balkar tribes in the Caucasus, boasted of being Magyars, and that the ruins of a Magyar town were yet visible to the S. W. of Astrakhan. Orlay reports that a Caucasian tribe, called Ugrichi by the Russians, speak a Hungarian idiom. Csoma de Kőrös, who went in search of the cradle of his nation, supposed an analogy to exist between the names of Sovar, Pennavar, &c., places in India and Hungary, and found several words in the Thibetan and other tongues of middle Asia, akin in sound and sense to the Magyar; without, however, being able to solve the mystery of the original home of the race. F. Thomas (1806) derives the Magyars from the ancient Egyptians; S. Horváth from the Ionians, or rather the Jászes.—Many Hungarian writers report that their ancestors brought from Asia works written in their national 34 characters, which were suppressed at the command of Pope Sylvester II. and with the aid of Stephen I., but which were, however, taught as late as the beginning of our century in remote places among the Szeklers, and may be seen in S. Gyarmathy's grammar as well as in George Hickey's *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus* (3 vols. fol., Oxford, 1703-'5), under the name of *Hunnorum litteræ*. The language is now accommodated to the Latin alphabet, and consists of 26 simple and 6 com-

pound sounds) agreeing, unless otherwise noticed, with the Italian, viz.: 8 vowels: *a* (like English *a* in what, swallow), *e*, *é* (French), *i* (also *y*), *o*, *u*, *ö* (Fr. *eu*), *ü* (Fr. *u*); 18 consonants: *b*, *d*, *f*, *g* hard, *h* (German), *j* (German), *k*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *p*, *r*, *s* (Eng. *sh*), *t*, *v* (also *w*), *z* (French), *sz* (Eng. *s*), *zs* (or 's, Fr. *j*); 4 compounds with *y*: *gy* (*dy*, as in *gyár*, factory, pron. *dyar*, in one syllable), *ly* (as in Fr. *filles*), *ny* (Fr. *gn*), *ty*; and 2 compound sibilants: *cs* (written also *ch*, *ts*; Eng. *tek*) and *cz* or *tz* (Eng. *ts*). With the addition of the vowels marked as long with the acute accent, as for instance *á* (long Italian *a*), *í*, *ó*, *ő*, *ú*, *ű*, there are 38 sounds in all, beside *x*, which is used only in foreign names, as in Xerxes. As in Turkish and other kindred tongues, the whole mass of words and grammatical forms is divided into two groups, viz., into those of high and low sound. The former is determined by the presence of *e*, *ö*, *ü*, the latter by that of *a*, *o*, *u*, in the roots or stems; those with *é* or *i* constitute a neutral ground. All formative and relative suffixes have, therefore, a double form, in harmony with the roots to which they are attached; thus: *váll*, shoulder, *vállal*, undertakes, *vállalat*, enterprise; but *becs*, worth, *becsül*, he respects, *becsület*, respect. Whatever changes the Magyar language may have undergone under adverse circumstances, amid hostile nations, it has yet retained its essential peculiarities of phonetism, grammar, and construction. Although it contains many Slavic, Latin, German, Greek, and other foreign words, it has digested them in its own way, assimilating them otherwise than the western nations have done with the same element; thus, *schola*, *cerea* (*candela*), Slav. *klas* (Lat. *arista*, *spica*), *hrubi*, Germ. *hoch*, *Sehnur*, became *iskola*, *gyertya*, *kálász*, *goromba*, *hegy* (mountain), *sinór*. The concurrence of harsh sounds and of consonants is as much avoided as in all the languages of central and eastern Asia. The roots remain unaltered, and most frequently bear the accent in all their derivatives.—The most peculiar feature of Hungarian grammar is its system of suffixes. In the possessive forms of nouns they are varied according to the number and person of the possessor and the number of the object, giving 12 distinct terminations, as follows: *házam*, my house, *házaim*, my houses; *házad*, thy house, *házaid*, thy houses; *háza*, his or her house, *házaik*, his or her houses; *házunk*, our house, *házaink*, our houses; *házatok*, your house, *házaitok*, your houses; *házok*, their house, *házaik*, their houses. In verbs they are made to indicate not only the voice, mood, and tense, and the person and number of the nominative, but the definiteness or indefiniteness of the object, and in one form (indicative present, 1st person singular) the person of the object, as *várlak*, I expect thee; *kérlek*, I ask thee. The following table exhibits the suffixes of the indicative present, the root being always the 3d person singular of the indefinite form, and the vowels varying, as above stated, in consonance with that of the root:

| Person. | Active. | | | | Passive. | |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------|--|
| | Definite. | | Indefinite. | | | |
| Singular. | 1 | -om, -em (-öm) | -ok, -ek (-ök) | -atom, -etem | | |
| | 2 | -od, -ed (-öd) | -sz (Root) | -atol, -etel | | |
| | 3 | -ja, -i | | -atik, -etik | | |
| Plural. | 1 | -juk, -jük | -unk, -ünk | -atunk, -etünk | | |
| | 2 | -játok, -itek | -tok, -tek (-tök) | -attok, -ettek | | |
| | 3 | -ják, -ik | -nak, -nek | -atnak, -etnek | | |

Examples: *várom*, I expect him, her, it, them, or the man; *várok*, I expect, wait; *váratom*, I am expected; *kéred*, thou askest him, &c.; *kérsz*, thou askest; *kéretel*, thou art asked; *látja*, he or she sees it; *lát*, lie or she sees; *látjuk*, we see it; *látunk*, we see, &c. Other moods and tenses are formed by inserting new letters or syllables between the above suffixes and the root, or in a few cases by a change of the final vowel or consonant, and by auxiliaries; thus: *vára*, waited; *váránk*, we waited; *vártunk*, we have waited; *várnánk*, we would wait; *várandok*, I shall wait; *várjátok*, that ye wait. The auxiliaries are: *volt* or *vala*, for the pluperfect; *legyen*, for the conjunctive past; *volna*, for the optative past. The infinitive is formed by suffixing *ni* to the root, as *várni*, to expect. A combined future is formed by the infinitive with the auxiliary verb *fog*; thus, *várni fogok*, I shall wait; *várni fogom*, I shall expect it. Possession is indicated by the irregular verb *lenni*, to be; *van*, is; *vannak*, are; *volt*, was; *lesz*, will be, &c.; thus: *anyám van* (mother-my is), I have a mother; also with the mark of the dative, *nekem vannak kerteim* (to-me are gardens-my, *mihi sunt horti*), I have gardens. Negation is expressed by *nem*, not; *nincs*, is not, *nincsenek*, are not; *sem*, is neither. Various kinds of verbs are made by affixing certain syllables, thus: *at* or *tat*, causative; *gal*, *gat*, &c., frequentative; *dúl*, inceptive; inserting *n*, diminutive; *hat*, potential; *it*, *int*, &c., transitive; *kodik*, reciprocal, *odik*, *kozik*, reflexive, &c. Examples: *ver*, he beats; *veret*, he causes to beat; *vereget* (*verdes*, *verdegél*), he beats often; *verint*, beats softly; *verekedik*, fights with; *verődik*, beats against; *vergődik*, beats himself (breaks) through; *verhet*, can beat; *verethet*, can cause to beat; *verinthe*, can beat gently; *verekedhetik*, can fight with somebody; *verődhetik*, can knock against; *vergődhetik*, can break through, &c. All these and similar derivatives can be conjugated throughout in the same way as the simple verb. There are beside these other compounds with prefixes: *alá*, down; *által*, through, by; *be*, in; *bele*, into; *el*, of, away; *ellen*, against; *fel*, up; *ki*, out; *össze*, together, &c.; and especially *meg*, which is an emphatic particle denoting attainment of the aim, accomplishment (like the German *er* and *be* in *erlangen*, *begraben*).—There is no gender; he and she are expressed by the same word. The definite article *az* or *a*' is of recent use. The adjective precedes the substantive, and receives the marks of relations only when standing by itself. The relations called cases and those expressed by prepositions in Indo-European languages are denoted in all Altaic tongues by suffixes. The plu-

ral is formed by *k*. Cases: *é*, genitive; *nak*, genitive and dative; *t*, *at*, accusative; *ban*, in; *ba*, into; *ból*, out of; *ért*, for; *hoz*, to; *ig*, till; *ként*, like, instead, as; *kép*, in manner of; *kor*, at the time of (about); *nál* (Latin *apud*, German *bei*), at; *on*, upon; *ról*, down; *ül*, instead, as; *vá* (changed) into; *val*, with, &c., by being harmonized with the stem. Examples: *szemeinkben*, eyes-our-in; *ebédeikkor*, dinners-their-at-the-time-of. The separable postpositions are of three categories: 1, answering to three questions, where? whither? whence? thus: *előtt*, before (where?); *elő*, before (whither?); *elől*, from before; such are *alatt*, below; *körött*, around; *között*, between, among; *megett*, behind; *mellett*, near by; 2, of two forms, as *hegyett*, *hegyé*, upon, &c.; 3, of one form, as *ellen*, against; *íránt*, regarding, &c. The comparative degree is formed by suffixing *bb*; the superlative by prefixing *leg* to the comparative; thus: *nagy*, great, *nagyobb*, greater, *legnagyobb*, greatest.—Pronouns: 1st person, *én*, I; *enyém*, mine; *nekem*, to me; *engemet*, me; *mi*, we; *miénk*, ours; *nekünk*, to us; *minket*, us; 2d person, *te*, *tiéd*, *neked*, *tégedet*; *ti*, *tiétek*, *nektek*, *titeket*; 3d person, of both genders, *ő*, *övé*, *neki*, *öt*; *ők*, *övék*, *nekik*, *öket*. These are joined with relative prefixes, thus: *bennem*, in me; *belőled*, out of thee; *hozzájok*, to them; *alattam*, under me; *alattad*, under thee, &c. In addressing a person we say *ön*, plural *önök*, or *kegyed*, plural *kegyetek*, for both genders; or *az úr*, sir (the lord or gentleman); *uraságod*, sirship-thy; *az asszony*, lady; *asszonságod*, ladyship-thy; formerly *maga*, self; to persons of lower standing, *kend*, you.—Numerals: *egy*, 1; *kettő*, *két*, 2; *három*, 3; *négy*, 4; *öt*, 5; *hat*, 6; *hét*, 7; *nyolcz*, 8; *kilencz*, 9; *tíz*, 10; *tizenegy*, 11, &c.; *húsz*, 20; *harmáncz*, 30; *negyven*, 40, &c.; *száz*, 100; *ezer*, 1000. Ordinals: *első*, 1st; *második*, 2d; the others are formed by suffixing *dik*, as *neyedik*, *századik*, &c. All other varieties are formed by suitable suffixes.—The formation of parts of speech, and of various categories of signification, is extremely luxuriant by means of suffixed letters or syllables, so that an indefinite and yet ever intelligible mass of words may be made to suit all conceptions and shades of meaning. This plasticity of the Magyar, together with its free syntax, renders it capable of expressing the turns of other tongues and the Greek and Latin metres with more ease and fidelity than almost any other language. We subjoin an example of construction and of elegiac distichs:

Férfiak! így szólott Pannon vész-istene hajdan:
Men! so spake Pannonia's war-god (its) of old:

Boldog földet adok, víjátok érte ha kell,
Blessed country give-I, fight-ye for-it if need,

'S vittanak elszántán nagy bátor nemzetek érte
and fought decidedly great brave nations for-it

'S véresen a' diadalt végre kinyerte magyar.
and bloodily the victory lastly gained (the) Hungarian.

Al' de viszály maradt a' népek' lelkein: a' föld
alas but discord remained the nations' souls-in: the land

Boldoggá nem tud lenni az átok alatt
happy-made not knows (can) be the curse under.
(Vörösmarty.)

—This language is spoken by more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the population of Hungary in its wider sense, by more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of that of Transylvania, and in some places of Moldavia, Wallachia, and Bukovina. It consists of four dialects, which do not differ so much as those of other tongues, viz.: the Gyori, of Raab or Trans-Danubian, and the Bihari on the Theiss, both represented in books; the Palócz in the Mátra mountains; in the contiguous districts of the counties of Heves, Borsod, Gömör, Hont, and Nógrád, with more genuine ancient Magyar words than the preceding; and the Székely in Transylvania and the contiguous countries, with many Tartaric words, and of a drawling pronunciation. The language has varied very little in progress of time.—HUNGARIAN LITERATURE is comparatively of late date. The introduction of the religion of Rome under King Stephen I. (997–1038) made the Latin, the language of its priests and teachers, predominant in the court, the higher institutions for education, administration, and justice, and among the higher classes in general, which found it the most convenient medium for communication with the representatives of the cultivated West and South in diplomacy, literature, or religion. Of the time of the Árpáds and the next following period only Latin chronicles are preserved, of which those of the “Anonymous Secretary of King Béla” (II.) and Simon Kéza, the *Chronicon Budense*, and the *Chronicon Rerum Hungaricarum* of John Turóczy (Thurocius), are the most remarkable. The court of Matthias Corvinus (1458–'90) at Buda was adorned by some distinguished native and foreign scholars of that age. Of the latter, Bonfinius wrote an interesting though often legendary history of Hungary in *Decades IV.*, which was published with a continuation by Sambucus (Basel, 1568). Galeotus wrote on Matthias himself, whose librarian he was, and Callimachus on Attila and Uladis'as I. Among the natives the poet Janus Pannonius holds the foremost rank. The preserved remnants of Hungarian writings of that period are very scanty. The spread of the reformation in the following century, as in most countries of Europe, promoted the culture of the native tongue. But the simultaneous disasters of the country, the Turkish and civil wars, and chiefly the introduction of the German element with the dynasty of the Hapsburgs, checked the development of a flourishing national literature. Parts of the Scriptures were translated into Hungarian during the 16th century by Komjáti, Erdősi, Heltai, Székely, Juhász, Károlyi, and others. Gál, Iuhász, Kulcsár, Telegdi, Décsi, Károlyi, and others distinguished themselves as orators. Tinódi, Valkai, Temesvári, and others sang the warlike exploits of their times in light verses, Kákonyi the deeds of Cyrus, Csáktornyai the heroes of the siege of Troy; Balassa, Rimai, and Erdősi composed lyrical poems of incomparably higher merit. In the 17th century the Hungarian muse found votaries in Zrinyi, the grandson of the defender of Sziget, who celebrated in rhymed alexan-

drines the deeds and death of that hero, in Liszti, Paskó, and Koháry, and especially in Gyöngyösi, who sang the defence of Murány by Maria Szécsi. Molnár and Káldi translated the Scriptures; the primate and cardinal Pázmán and Keeskeméti were distinguished as orators; Csere even published a cyclopædia of sciences and a treatise on logic in Hungarian. This national movement in literature was paralyzed by the growing influence of the German dynasty; the bloody persecutions of the patriots under Leopold I. (1657-1705) suppressed it almost entirely. The Latin again became prominent, being cultivated in the 18th century by a large number of scholars in every branch, who vied with each other in the purity of their dead idiom, and compared with whom the Hungarian writers Faludi and Bessenyei, the founders of a classical and a French school in poetry, Orczy, Count Teleky, Baróczi, Révay, and others, formed but a feeble minority. A new and fertile period began about the close of the last century, chiefly in consequence of the despotic measures of Joseph II. (1780-'90) for the Germanization of the country, which caused a lively and general reaction. Societies for the cultivation of the national tongue were formed, literary, political, and scientific periodicals started, national theatres established, and various linguistic theories developed. This movement, being identical with the general regeneration of the nation, and enthusiastically promoted by the foremost statesmen and orators of the country, became triumphant over all foreign elements after the first quarter of the present century, about the beginning of which Francis Kazinczy, the great reformer of the language after Révay, and the popular poet Csokonai, appear as the foremost in literature. The poets Dayka, Verseghy, and Virág, and the novelist Dugonics, were their contemporaries. The lyrical "Loves of Himfy" (*Himfy szerelmei*), by Alexander Kisfaludy (1801), were received with general admiration, and were followed by his "Tales" (*Regék*) and other poems. Berzsenyi wrote glowing odes in Roman metre. The poets Andrew Horváth, Döbrentei, Vitkovics, Kis, and Paul Szemere, belong both to the period of regeneration and to the golden age of Hungarian literature, which embraces the 30 years preceding the revolution of 1848-'9. This period opens with the simultaneous activity of 5 classical writers, Charles Kisfaludy, the brother of Alexander, Kölcsey, Fáy, Czuczor, and Vörösmarty, of whom only the last 3 survived it. Kisfaludy may be regarded as the creator of the Hungarian drama by his tragedies, and still more by his really national comedies, some of which are as yet unsurpassed. Kölcsey's lyrical poems, ballads, and prose writings, including orations, are distinguished by a spirit of ardent patriotism and philosophical philanthropy, as well as by a rare precision and harmony of diction. Fáy's "Fables" (*Mesék*) are excellent specimens of that kind of poetry, in the manner of Lessing. Czuczor, distinguished

also as a grammarian and lexicographer, is chiefly renowned for his popular songs and his historical epics in hexameter, the "Battle of Augsburg" (*Augsburgi ütközet*) and "Assembly of Arad" (*Aradi gyűlés*). The latter, however, were excelled by the more numerous epics of Vörösmarty, "Cserhalom," "The Flight of Zalán" (*Zalán futása*), "Erlan" (*Eger*), &c., which, together with his tragedies, short novels, songs, and especially odes and ballads, gave him the foremost rank among the writers of his nation. In lyrical poetry, next to Vörösmarty and Kölcsey we find Bajza, who is also remarkable as an æsthetic critic and historical writer, Peter Vajda, John Erdélyi, Kunoss, Alexander Vachott, Császár, and especially Garay, whose ballads also rival those of Vörösmarty. Toward the close of the period appear the three youthful popular poets Tompa, Arany, and Petőfi, of whom the first two excelled chiefly in tales and legends, and the last in light and playful songs, whose subjects are love, liberty, independence, nature, and all that can touch the heart or inspire imagination. Fictitious literature was chiefly cultivated, if not created, by Jósika, whose historical novels, "Abafi," "The Last of the Báthoris" (*Utolsó Báthory*), "The Bohemians in Hungary" (*Csehek Magyarországon*), &c., exercised the greatest influence upon the development of Hungarian prose after Kazinczy. Smaller though not inferior works were written by Peter Vajda. In many respects both were surpassed by Eötvös, whose "Carthusian" (*A carthausi*), a philosophical romance, "Village Notary" (*A falu jegyzője*), an admirable picture of recent political life in Hungary, and "Hungary in 1514" (*Magyarország 1514-ben*), a historical novel, place him among the most eminent writers of his age. Kuthy is often eminent in pictures of nature, and Ignatius Nagy in caricaturing characters; both produced imitations of Sue's "Mysteries," taken from Hungarian life, but disfigured by unnatural exaggerations. Kemény and Jókai belong also to a more recent period. The principal dramatic authors beside Kisfaludy and Vörösmarty were Katona (*Bánk Bán*), Laurentius Tóth, Garay, Szicligeti, who is eminent in popular plays, Gál ("The Notary of Peleske"), I. Nagy, Emeric Vahot, Paul Kovács, and Czakó. Travels were written by Belenyei (America), Császár (Italy); Bartholomew Szemere, Irinyi, L. Tóth, and Gorove (western Europe); Méhes (Switzerland), Jerney (south-eastern Europe), and Reguly (northern Russia), the work of Szemere being one of the most remarkable productions of the period; political works by Széchenyi, Wesselényi, Kossuth, Eötvös, Szalay, B. Szemere, and others; the best histories by M. Horváth, Péczely, and Jászay (Hungary), Bajza (ancient world), and Toldy (national literature); philosophical treatises by Szontágh, Márki, Gregus, and others; the best statistical works by Fényes, Vállas, and Kőváry. Natural sciences, theology, languages, and antiquities also found numerous representatives. The best grammatical and lex-

icographical works on the national language were written by Czuczor, Fogarassy, and Bloch. The beautiful songs of the people were published in various collections, among others by Erdélyi; miscellaneous writings by Pulszky, Lukács, Frankenburg, Gabriel Kazinczy, Gondol, Berecz, Pompéry, Amelia Bezerédy, Theresa Karacs, and others. Of translators we will mention only Szabó, who published an admirable metrical version of Homer. During the revolution of 1848-'9 the muses were silent, excepting only the stirring songs of war. The battle field closed many a glorious career, as in the case of Petőfi, and destroyed many an incipient genius, as in that of the eloquent Vasvári. After the close of the war the dungeon, the scaffold, and exile doomed the most gifted of the nation to silence. The last 12 years are therefore in a literary respect far behind the preceding period, although the unabated enthusiasm of the people for the preservation of their only remaining national treasure, the language, has given rise to a large number of productions of different degrees of merit. Some of them, mostly belonging to the surviving representatives of the preceding period, are worthy of their great popularity. In poetry the imitators of Petőfi have been numerous. Among the most remarkable publications of the last 12 years are the poems of Tompa, Arany, Sárossy, Lisznyai, Lévai, Gyulai, Nicholas Szemere, Szász, Jámbor (Hiador), Sükei, Szelestei, Bozzai, Losonczy, Székely, and others; the novels of Kemény, Jósika, Jókai, Pálffy, Gyulai, and Bérczy; the humorous writings of Bernát and Radakovics (Vas Gereben); the historical works of Szalay, Joseph Teleky, Jászay, Toldy, Osen-gery, Palugyai, Mészáros, Fejér, Hunfalvy, &c.; the political writings of Eötvös and Kemény; the translations of Stephen and Charles Szabó, Hunfalvy, Osen-gery, Irinyi, Szász, and Sükei; the travels of Andrásy (India), Nendtwich (America), Podmaniczky (northern Europe), Magyar (southern Africa), &c.; the dramas of Szigligeti and others. Journalism and oratory, both of which had attained their highest development during the later period of Kossuth's agitation, have comparatively suffered the most noticeable decay through the complete extinction of the liberty of the press and speech, after the revolution. This sketch, which includes various Magyar productions of the Transylvanian press, excludes all more modern non-Magyar literary productions of Hungary belonging to the Slavic, German, Wallachian, or other literatures, as well as those of the Hungarian exiles (Mr. and Mrs. Pulszky, Ludvigh, Szarvady, &c.) in foreign languages.—Among the principal works on Hungarian history (in various languages) are those of Bel, Pray, Gebhardi, Katona, Fessler, Engel, Majláth, Horváth, Péczely, Toldy, A. de Gérando, and Szalay; on the last revolution, the memoirs or sketches of Klapka, Görgey, Czecz, Szemere, Schlesinger, Horn, Szabad, and Irányi and Chassin.

HUNGER, the sensation by which the necessity for food is made known to the system, re-

ferred to the stomach, but indicating the wants of the system at large; impelling us to supply the waste of the tissues consequent on all vital acts, and in proportion to the activity of the animal functions from exercise, &c. If the desire cannot be gratified, or if absent from disease, the phenomena of inanition or of starvation are induced, with a diminution of the bulk of nearly all the tissues and proportionate weakness. Hunger is greatest in the young and growing state, and least in old age, when the vital operations are deficient in activity. It varies with the amount of heat to be generated in the body; external cold increases hunger, while heat diminishes it; hence the voracious appetite of the arctic regions, and the general use of stimulating condiments in the tropics; it is also increased by any unusual drain upon the system, as in profuse suppuration, lactation, and diabetes, in the last of which especially hunger is almost insatiable. In health, the feeling of hunger is a very good indication of the demands of the system for food, and it becomes the stimulant to mental operations, automatic in infancy, but directed by intelligence in the adult, which have for their object the gratification of the desire. Hunger depends rather upon the demand of the system for aliment than upon the state of emptiness of the stomach. The sense of hunger may be, however, immediately dependent on some condition of the stomach; it is well known that the swallowing of indigestible and non-nutritious substances will temporarily relieve it. The wants of the general system in this respect are probably communicated to the sensorium by the pneumogastric nerves and to the stomach by the sympathetic; through the latter the capillary circulation and the gastric secretion are excited, the latter relieving the former, which is believed by Carpenter to be the proximate cause of hunger by its action on the nervous centres; the act of secretion unloads the vessels, and relieves the hunger for the time, but if the food do not supply the wants of the system, the feeling of hunger returns with increased intensity. On the other hand, mere emptiness of the stomach does not produce hunger, as is evident from the fact that an ample supply of food passes entirely from the stomach hours before this sensation is felt, and that in disease there may be no desire for food for many days with total abstinence from it. The stomach may be full of food, and, if the products of digestion cannot pass from it because of pyloric or other obstruction, the sense of hunger is not appeased; moreover, hunger may be relieved by the injection of alimentary fluids into the large intestine, in cases where the stomach cannot receive or retain food.

HUNS (Lat. *Hunni*), a people of northern Asia who in the 5th century invaded and conquered a great part of Europe. Of their origin little is known with certainty. Under the name of Chuni they were known to the Greeks, and are mentioned by Ptolemy as early as the 2d

acts of pillage. Rushing forward and seeking out the officers, he upbraided them angrily for their conduct. "Who is he who dares to speak thus?" they exclaimed. "I am Kosciuszko," he replied. For 20 years his name had been heard by them but as that of a hapless exile. The effect of his appearance now was electric. Throwing down their arms, the soldiers prostrated themselves at his feet, and supplicated Kosciuszko's pardon. The emperor Alexander, who, in an audience subsequently, held him long in conversation, made him the most flattering promises. Kosciuszko repaired to Vienna, but after the battle of Waterloo he was strangely neglected, and soon left the seat of the great European congress. In 1816 he went to live in Switzerland, making his home at Soleure, whence in the following year he sent a deed of manumission to all the serfs upon his Polish estate. His death was caused by a fall from his horse over a precipice. His remains were removed by the emperor Alexander to the cathedral church of Cracow, where they repose by the side of Poniatowski and Sobieski. Near Cracow there is a mound of earth 150 feet high, which was raised to his memory by the people, supplies of earth being brought in contribution to the mass from every great battle field upon which Polish soldiers had shed their blood.

KOSEGARTEN, JOHANN GOTTFRIED LUDWIG, son of the poet Ludwig Theobul Kosegarten, a German orientalist, born at Altenkirchen, Sept. 10, 1792. He went to Paris in 1812 to study the oriental languages under Chézy and Silvestre de Sacy. On his return to Germany in 1815 he was appointed to the chair of oriental literature at Jena, which he exchanged in 1824 for the corresponding chair at Greifswalde. His principal works are an edition of the *Moal-laka* of the Arabian poet Amru ben Kelthum (Jena, 1819); a German translation of the Indian poem *Nala* (Jena, 1820), and of *Tuti nameh*, a collection of Persian tales, made in collaboration with Iken (Stuttgart, 1822); an account of Aharone ben Elihu's commentary on the Caraitic Pentateuch (Jena, 1824); remarks on the Egyptian text of a papyrus in the Minutoli collection at Berlin (Greifswalde, 1824); editions of the Arabian annals of Taberi (Greifswalde, 1831); of the collection of songs entitled *Kitab al Aghani* (Greifswalde, 1840), and of Indian fables entitled *Pantshatantra* (Bonn, 1848); and some important works on the history of Pomerania.

KOSSUTH, a N. co. of Iowa, drained by a branch of Des Moines river; area, 576 sq. m.; pop. in 1859, 510. It has an undulating surface and a fertile soil. The productions in 1859 were 10,863 bushels of Indian corn, 277 of wheat, 800 of oats, 4,526 of potatoes, and 1,500 tons of hay.

KOSSUTH, LAJOS (LOUIS), late governor of Hungary, born in the village of Monok, county of Zemplén, April 27, 1802. His family, originally of Slavic descent, were members of the Lutheran confession and noble. His father, a

patriotic and public-spirited lawyer, gave his children a liberal education. Lajos, the only son, received his first classical instruction in the gymnasium of the Piarists at Ujhely, the capital of his native county, studied subsequently at Eperies, and finally passed through a course of legal and philosophical studies at the college of Patak. The spirit which animated this last institution has almost always been one of opposition to the rule of Austria; patriotic remembrances were attached to the place itself and its environs, once the possession of Francis Rákóczy, the leader in the last and most successful of the long struggles waged by the Hungarian patriots for civil and religious liberty in the 17th and at the beginning of the 18th century. The 8 years' strife under Rákóczy had exhausted the nation; the mild reigns of Charles VI. and his daughter Maria Theresa had lulled the spirit of independence into slumber. But the unconstitutional sway of Joseph II. had rekindled the fire of patriotism, and the wars of France carried revolutionary ideas into every quarter of Europe. When Kossuth, who had received from his parents an enthusiastic nature and liberal sentiments, reached the age of manhood, Spain, Italy, and Greece were struggling for freedom; Francis, the ruler of the empire in which Hungary was lost, was through his minister Metternich the arbiter of despotism in Europe; at no great distance from Patak, Ypsilante, the martyr of Hellenic liberty, pined in the dungeon of Munkács, and Hegyalja, to which both Ujhely and Patak belong, was a favorite resort of patriotic Poles who were secretly preparing to throw off the triple yoke of their country. Kossuth was well read in history, and spoke with almost equal fluency the Magyar, Slovak, German, French, and Latin tongues, the last of which was still in part the legal language of his country. The institutions of Hungary were purely aristocratic, and as regards the great bulk of the people in a high degree oppressive; but in their constitutional form, in the municipal autonomy of the counties, the periodicity of the diets and municipal assemblies, the freedom and publicity of debate, and the vast numbers of the nobility, they not only possessed essential guaranties against the bureaucratic absolutism of Vienna, but also vital germs of progress and future general freedom. Jealousy of the constitutional bulwarks, and a gradual extension of the constitutional franchise, formed the programme of the Hungarian progressives, in whose spirit Kossuth made his political début, shortly after leaving college, in the assembly of his native county, of which he was appointed an assessor (*táblabíró*). He soon became noted as a liberal, exceedingly popular with the lower classes, was patronized by many of the higher nobility, but disliked by others, and was successful in the legal profession, on which he relied for his maintenance, being for some time the legal and fiscal manager of the estates of the countess Szapáry in Zemplén. During the ravages of the cholera in 1831, and the outbreak of the peasantry which accompa-

nied them in that county, he displayed a remarkable activity, which augmented his popularity. He soon after repaired to Presburg as proxy of a magnate or member of the upper house of the diet, in which capacity he had a deliberative voice, but no vote, in the lower. Having tried unsuccessfully on one occasion to secure the attention of the house, he subsequently shared the silence of his fellow proxies, but his pen was actively and more effectively employed. The diet of 1832-'6, which in several ways ameliorated the condition of the peasantry, ranks among the more important assemblies of modern Hungary. Its debates, closely following the Polish tragedy of 1831, were watched with lively anxiety by the patriots, but their publicity was hindered by severe restrictions on the press. The opposition, at the suggestion of Kossuth, resorted to the extraordinary means of a written newspaper for the information of their constituents and the public at large, and intrusted him with the laborious task, which he performed with equal ardor, skill, and perseverance. The *Országgyűlési tudósítások* ("Parliamentary Communications"), extracts and comments, were dictated by him to a large number of copyists, and widely circulated in spite of the obstacles thrown in the way by the post office. The opposition party and its organ gained alike in popularity by this not always impartial diffusion of liberal ideas throughout the country. After the close of the diet, Kossuth endeavored to continue his activity by a lithographic paper, *Törvényhatósági tudósítások* ("Municipal Communications"), edited in Pesth, and destined to form a central organ and bond of union of the opposition in the county assemblies. The government, now freed from the jealous watchfulness of the diet, prohibited its publication. Kossuth, who received the prohibition in an unconstitutional way, resisted, putting himself under the protection of the county of Pesth. The government sent its prohibition to the latter. The assembly refused to obey, declaring all censorship unconstitutional, and its exercise a usurpation. Numerous other counties supported Kossuth with equal zeal. The government now resorted to open violence, and caused the young journalist with several other advocates of the popular cause, among them the fiery Transylvanian agitator Baron Nicholas Wesselényi, to be arrested by the soldiery. Kossuth was seized in the night at his summer residence in the mountains of Buda (May 2, 1837), tried, and finally condemned for treason to 4 years' imprisonment. A general outburst of indignation and an unprecedented agitation followed these acts. The liberals carried the elections for the diet of 1839-'40, and answered the government propositions, the principal of which were demands for subsidies in money and men, with a demand for the liberation of the prisoners. The Thiers ministry in France threatening a general movement in Europe, which was then agitated by the Egyptian question, the cabinet of Vienna was compelled to yield. One of the

prisoners, Lovassy, was mad; Wesselényi left his prison blind; Kossuth left that of Buda enfeebled in body, but with a mind enriched by earnest meditation on political questions. His liberation was hailed with loud demonstrations, but he had lost his father. In the house of his mother he made the acquaintance of Theresa Meszlényi, an accomplished young lady whom he afterward married, while her brother married his sister Susanna. The laws of 1840, enacted under the leadership in the house of deputies of Francis Deák of Zala, gave new vigor to the opposition; its tendencies became broader, its supporters more numerous. It was at this juncture that Landerer, a publisher of Pesth, having received from the government a license for the publication of a semi-weekly journal with the right of choosing its editor, invited Kossuth to assume its direction. The *Pesti hírlap* ("Pesth Journal") started Jan. 1, 1841, with fewer than 100 subscribers, but in a month they were numbered by thousands. Reform after reform was proposed, every abuse in institutions, laws, and practice was scrutinized and denounced, every question of general interest discussed. The national, moral, and material regeneration of the people, of the whole people, was the avowed aim; the existing constitution was to serve as a means; the aristocracy to have the lead. Turning to the latter in his programme, Kossuth exclaimed: "With you, if you choose; without you or against you, if it must be." The ability with which he managed to break his way through the difficulties created by Metternich's censors of the press was admirable. Not only the government and the conservatives of the higher nobility were alarmed; Count Stephen Széchenyi himself, a renowned patriot and moderate champion of reform, was the first to appear in the lists against the innovator, who ventured so far beyond the former programme of the opposition. In a book entitled *Kelet népe* ("People of the East"), he denounced him as a dangerous agrarian and demagogue. An admirer of the English constitution, Széchenyi was ready to bestow freedom on the people as a gift; Kossuth demanded it as a right, and threatened to extort it. Material progress and practical calculation were foremost in the views of the former, liberty and enthusiasm in those of the latter. Kossuth replied to Széchenyi in a *Felelet* ("Answer"). Baron Eötvös declared in his favor in the pamphlet *Pesti hírlap és Kelet népe*. The conservatives found an able advocate in Count Aurel Dessewffy, who began an acrimonious warfare against the agitator in the columns of the *Világ* ("Light"), which was continued after his death by his brother Count Emil Dessewffy in that paper, and subsequently in the *Budapesti híradó* ("Buda-Pesth Intelligencer"). Public opinion was decidedly in favor of Kossuth, and the *Pesti hírlap* not only became the regular organ of the opposition, which again carried the elections in 1843, but also the oracle of the younger portion of the nation. The diet of 1843-'4,

though deprived of the leading and organizing talents of Deák, had in Count Louis Batthyányi and Baron Eötvös, the leaders of the upper house, in Klauzál, Beöthy, Szentkirályi, Palóczy, Szemere, Bezerédy, Pázmándy, Ghiczy, and others, a number of bold and eloquent advocates of popular rights; and the whole tenor of the debates, though the conservatism of the majority of the house of magnates prevented much from being done, impelled the government to a series of new reactionary efforts. The autonomy of the counties was assailed. A difficulty with the publisher, which was not believed to be accidental, removed Kossuth from the editorship of the *Pesti hírlap*, which was transferred to Szalay (July 1, 1844). Kossuth received no license for another journal, and as the new editor of his former organ belonged to a branch of the opposition, the friends of centralization under the lead of Eötvös, to which he was most heartily opposed, he found no better medium for the occasional publication of his views than the *Hetilap* ("Weekly Paper"), a small industrial sheet. He was, however, far from yielding an easy triumph to the government. Not satisfied with the influence he exercised by his eloquence in the quarterly assemblies of the county of Pesth, which played a leading part in the debates of the nation, he sought a new arena for agitation in the yet unrestricted sphere of association. Hungary, separated from the other provinces of the Austrian empire by watchfully guarded barriers, was exhausted by a tariff calculated to keep it for ever in a state of colonial dependence on the German provinces, which, on their part, were protected by another tariff in their industrial developments against the competition of England, France, or Belgium. This system formed one of the chief grievances of the nation, and the orators of the diet of 1843-'4 had in vain exhausted all the powers of their oratory in denouncing it. Assisted by the most influential members of the opposition, among others by Counts Louis and Casimir Batthyányi, Kossuth now founded the *Védegylet* (protective union), an association whose members, men and women, bound themselves for 5 years to use exclusively home-made productions, whenever these could be had. Other societies, agricultural, commercial, and industrial, were practically to assist the protective union. The latter soon counted their members by hundreds of thousands, affiliated in all parts of the country. Kossuth was the animating spirit of the whole organization, which for various reasons, originating in part in the industrial condition of the country, and in part in the character of the people, proved less effective for its direct purpose, the development of home industry, than for the no less important end of keeping alive the national agitation. Most of the practical projects failed, among others that of constructing a railroad from the lower Danube to the Adriatic at Fiume, as a national channel for the exportation of Hungarian products, and for a direct communication with England.

After some time the protective union languished, and even the personal popularity of Kossuth seemed to be on the decrease, when the elections of 1847, coinciding with the movements in Switzerland, Italy, and elsewhere, precursory to the revolutions of the following year, gave a new turn to affairs. Kossuth appeared with Szentkirályi as a candidate for the county of Pesth. The efforts of the government party to prevent his election were immense, but fruitless; the influence of the Batthyányis and their friends prevailed. The programme of the opposition at the opening of the diet was bolder and more distinctly democratic than before. In order personally to combat his eloquent antagonist, Count Széchenyi, although entitled by his rank to a seat in the upper house, had himself elected to the lower for Wieselburg. A few sessions sufficed to establish Kossuth as a recognized leader of the house; his eloquence, surpassing knowledge of the history and statistics of his own and other countries, untiring energy, and perfect mastery of every question, made him irresistible. His attitude toward the government was now one of open hostility. The uncompromising opposition between the two parties seemed to condemn the diet to inaction, when the news of the Paris revolution of Feb. 1848 reached Presburg. Kossuth hesitated not a moment to take advantage of the state of affairs. The time of compromises between the rule of Metternich and the constitutionalism of Hungary was gone. In a speech delivered on March 3, he proposed an address to the king (the emperor Ferdinand), urging the restoration of Hungary to its former independence as a state, and the granting of a charter of liberty for the whole Austrian empire. The house of deputies accepted the propositions almost unanimously; the upper house wavered, but the people of Vienna, taking the matter into their own hands, decided the question on March 13. Metternich fled. Kossuth was received in the capital of the empire, whither he now carried his address, with the honors of a liberator, and Louis Batthyányi was intrusted by Ferdinand with the formation of an independent Hungarian ministry. Simultaneously Pesth had its day of revolution, March 15. Kossuth received the department of finance in the new ministry, which embraced the most distinguished representatives of the opposition movement since 1825, Széchenyi, the late adversary of Kossuth, Deák, Klauzál, Eötvös, and Szemere. The long urged measures of liberal reform were now carried in an amplified shape, and when on April 11, 1848, the last diet of Presburg closed its sessions, to make room for a national assembly in Pesth, the noble members might have boasted of having agitated and carried through the abolition of their own most essential prerogatives, and prepared for the advent of democracy. This great revolution was thus executed by peaceful and legal means; but a bloody conflict was to follow. Kossuth well knew it, and though anxious to avert it, made

ready for every emergency. Losing little time in enjoying the honors of his triumph, he devoted all his energies, as the leading spirit of the new government, to the organization and consolidation of its powers. The difficulties were enormous. The Hungarian troops were abroad, and foreigners under foreign officers garrisoned the fortresses and principal cities. The Slavic population of the south of Hungary, long agitated by Pan-Slavic tendencies fostered by Russia, and still more by the tools of the cabinet at Vienna, rose in insurrection against the new order of things. The new ban of Croatia, Jellachich, took arms ostensibly for the independence of his province, but in reality for the restoration of absolutism. The Wallachs and Saxons in Transylvania, which was to be reunited with Hungary, joined the reactionary movement. The "camarilla" of Vienna, and afterward of Innsbruck, was soon reassured and emboldened by successes in Galicia, Prague, and Italy. The Hungarian treasury was empty; ammunition, arms, and military experience were wanting; few officers of rank could be trusted; the Magyars of the north had not heard the sound of cannon since the times of Rákóczy, those of the south since the wars of Eugene. Kossuth created a treasury, organized the militia, formed new battalions of national soldiery (*honvéds*), established armories, and roused the spirit of the nation by proclamations, speeches, and articles in his new organ, *Kossuth hírlapja* (edited by Bajza), though at the same time neglecting no means of bringing about a peaceful solution of the difficulties. His speech to the diet at Pesth, July 11, in which he demanded the granting of 200,000 men and 42,000,000 florins for the defence of the country, was a masterpiece of eloquence. A small radical opposition had already formed itself, but its spokesman Nyáry was the first to rise with the solemn declaration: "We grant it." The king, however, refused his sanction. The south of Hungary and Transylvania were already bleeding in an internecine struggle of races, in which the Rascians, old enemies of the Magyars, were particularly conspicuous. All Batthyányi's endeavors and a deputation of the diet, consisting of 120 members, to the court of Vienna, were of no avail. Reaction was triumphant everywhere, the camarilla was flushed by the victories of Radetzky, and Jellachich crossed the Drave with a large army to subdue Hungary. Batthyányi resigned; the palatine Stephen was in vain invoked to mediate, and finally fled; Jellachich was approaching the capital. Kossuth in the meantime had begun his armaments and issued treasury notes without the sanction of the king, and, in a proclamation full of oriental fire, he called upon the people to rise and vindicate their rights, threatening them with the contempt of the nations in case of cowardly submission. He repaired to the people of the Theiss, who flocked around his banners, and on his return entered upon a new course of activity, as head of the "committee of defence."

The war of revolution was thus begun. (See HUNGARY.) It was from beginning to end a struggle for life or death under inauspicious circumstances. The Magyars and their kindred the Szeklers of Transylvania, supported by the German and Jewish population and a part of the Slovaks and Ruthenians, as well as by volunteers from Poland, Vienna, the Tyrol, and Italy, fought with exalted enthusiasm against the regular forces of Austria, against Croats, Slavonians, Rascians, military borderers, Serbs from Turkey, Wallachs, Saxons, and Cecho-Slovakish volunteers, and finally against the armies of Russia. Several of the fortresses of the country, Temesvár, Arad, Carlsburg, &c., were in the hands of the enemy; communication with foreign countries was impossible; the way for invasion was open on every side; hesitation, wavering, and dissensions were almost unavoidable. Still, after many defeats, valor and enthusiasm triumphed for a time over discipline and the difficulties of the situation, and the world abroad saw with astonishment bands of volunteers and raw levies transformed into victorious armies; fortresses taken by assault; a province of Austria converted into an independent state; a journalist placed at the head of a nation, once renowned for loyalty, as responsible "governing president;" and the fields of the Theiss becoming the scene of a final decision between absolutism and democracy in Europe. The overwhelming power of Russia, the obstinate disobedience of one of the revolutionary commanders, the want of arms, and the indifference of the governments of Europe, or rather their connivance with Russia and Austria, finally decided against Hungary and Kossuth, its moral dictator. It is hard to determine whether he could have averted the catastrophe by a timely removal of Görgey. Certain it is that such a step would have been at any time dangerous. The victorious general was the favorite of his army and the choice of his officers. He generally operated independently, and the services of his army could at no moment be spared, the state of affairs being continually one of imminent peril. To dismiss him was impossible; to arrest and imprison him would have provoked mutinies for his release; to have him tried and executed for what could hardly be called treason would have been regarded as a murder committed for the removal of a rival, guilty only of having acquired too much glory in the service of the country. That Kossuth was on many occasions too scrupulous in guarding his reputation has since, and perhaps not without reason, often been asserted. But it was also this unstained reputation of the revolutionary dictatorship which formed one of the principal sources of its successes. It inspired the people with confidence, the diet with unanimity, the non-Magyars with love for the national leaders. Never had a revolution in Europe been carried on with so little internal strife, amid so much personal freedom, with such order and legality. The bitterest former assailants of Kossuth, Des-

sewffy, I. Nagy, and others, lived unharmed; those who afterward became his assailants, as Szemere and Casimir Batthyányi, acted in harmony with him to the last moment of the revolution; generals of independent will and character, as Perczel and others, except Görgey, obeyed, though reluctantly. On Aug. 11, 1849, Kossuth transferred his powers to Görgey, who two days later surrendered to the Russians. Kossuth, like Tökölyi and Rákóczy, the leaders of the Hungarian patriots in similar movements of former centuries, sought refuge in Turkey. This state was certainly not ill disposed toward the refugees, with whom it shared the hatred of Russia, but fear of that empire led it to an apparently unfriendly course. Kossuth and his followers were confined in Widin, Shumla, and subsequently in Kutaieh in Asia Minor. His extradition was demanded by Austria and Russia, but though he refused with scorn the proposed means of evading all danger by an adoption of the Mohammedan religion, the Porte, true to the principle of hospitality, so sacred to Moslems, and encouraged by England and France, resisted all threats; and finally, at the intervention of the United States and England, he was allowed to depart with his family and friends. His wife had secretly escaped from Hungary, and his 3 children, 2 sons and a daughter, had also been allowed by Haynau to join him in Asia. On Sept. 1, 1851, he was liberated and set out to embark on the war steamer Mississippi, Capt. Long, which had been despatched by the United States government, in accordance with a resolution of the senate, to convey him to America as the nation's guest. The Mississippi touched at the ports of Smyrna, Spezia in Italy, and Marseilles. He was received with lively demonstrations of sympathy by the population, but the governments of both Sardinia and France refused to allow him a passage through their territory to England. In Marseilles he published a stirring address in French to the people. Worn out by cares and grief at the fall of his country and the death of its most zealous defenders, he was yet unbroken in spirit, and he had employed the days of his confinement in Asia not only in the study of military science, but also in perfecting his knowledge of living languages. He was able to address the people of the West in French, English, German, and Italian. Preparatory to pleading the cause of his country before the people of Great Britain and the United States, he had made English his special study; and when, after visiting Gibraltar and Lisbon, where he was treated with distinction, he finally reached Southampton, he was listened to with no less admiration than sympathy by the English. The same enthusiastic feeling followed him on his tour through the most populous cities of the kingdom, and subsequently through the United States, where he arrived Dec. 5, 1851, accompanied by his wife and Mr. and Mrs. Pulszky. He addressed numberless deputations and meetings in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Annapolis, Pittsburg, Cleveland, Co-

lumbus, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Louisville, St. Louis, Jackson, Mobile, New Haven, Springfield, Worcester, Boston, Salem, Albany, Buffalo, Syracuse, Utica, and numerous other places, urging the acknowledgment of the claims of Hungary to independence, and the interference of the United States jointly with England in behalf of the principle of non-intervention, which would allow the nations of Europe fair play in a new struggle for liberty. His agitation received a fatal blow by the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon, the news of which arrived about a fortnight after his landing, almost entirely destroying the hope for a speedy regeneration of Europe. His call for effective aid in contributions for a reopening of the struggle in Hungary had therefore a very small result, in spite of the general sympathy with the exile and his cause. At the seat of the federal government he was received with distinctions which had never been bestowed on any foreigner except Lafayette. At a banquet given him by the members of both houses of congress, and at which he was addressed among others by Daniel Webster and Gen. Cass, he began his speech with the following words: "Sir: as once Cineas the Epirote stood among the senators of Rome, who with a word of self-conscious majesty arrested kings in their ambitious march, thus, full of admiration and of reverence, I stand among you, legislators of the new capitol, that glorious hall of your people's collective majesty. The capitol of old yet stands, but the spirit has departed from it, and is come over to yours, purified by the air of liberty. The old stands, a mournful monument of the fragility of human things; yours as a sanctuary of eternal right. The old beamed with the red lustre of conquest, now darkened by the gloom of oppression; yours is bright with freedom. The old absorbed the world into its own centralized glory; yours protects your own nation from being absorbed, even by itself. The old was awful with unrestricted power; yours is glorious by having restricted it. At the view of the old, nations trembled; at the view of yours, humanity hopes. To the old, misfortune was introduced with fettered hands to kneel at triumphant conquerors' feet; to yours the triumph of introduction is granted to unfortunate exiles who are invited to the honor of a seat. And where kings and Cæsars never will be hailed for their power and wealth, there the persecuted chief of a down-trodden nation is welcomed as your great republic's guest, precisely because he is persecuted, helpless, and poor. In the old, the terrible *væ victis!* was the rule; in yours, protection to the oppressed, malediction to ambitious oppressors, and consolation to a vanquished just cause. And while from the old a conquered world was ruled, you in yours provide for the common federative interests of a territory larger than that old conquered world. There sat men boasting that their will was sovereign of the earth; here sit men whose glory is to acknowledge 'the laws of nature and nature's God,' and to do what their sovereign, the people,

wills." With honors and distinction, however, he received not a little criticism and reproach, which also pursued him through his subsequent course in Europe, where he returned in July, 1852, and where he for some time acted in concert with Mazzini and Ledru-Rollin, forming with them a kind of revolutionary triumvirate. Preparations for a rising in the spring of 1853, which rapidly consumed the contributions received in the United States, ended with the execution of Jubal, Noszlopi, and others in Hungary, and with the banishment of Kossuth's patriotic mother and sisters. His mother died soon after in Brussels; one of his sisters, Mme. Mészlányi, died some time after her arrival in the United States, where the other two, Mme. Zulyavsky and Mme. Ruttkay, still reside. The outbreak of Milan (Feb. 1853, during which an old proclamation of Kossuth's was used by the friends of Mazzini, led to a misunderstanding with the latter, and to an investigation by the English government of the doings of the political refugees, which however proved nothing against Kossuth. The hopes inspired by the war against Russia also proved delusive. Kossuth's published remarks on the false strategical course pursued in that war by the allies were but too well justified by the development of events. After some participation in newspaper discussions, he finally resumed his activity as a public speaker, delivering lectures on various topics of European interest, but especially on the history and affairs of Hungary, in various cities of England and Scotland, on the proceeds of which he has since relied for the maintenance of his family. The preparations of Napoleon and Victor Emanuel for a war against Austria at the beginning of 1859 once more rekindled his hope for the liberation of Hungary; and the speech for the neutrality of England in the war, which he was called upon to deliver by the friends of Italy in London, and the marked influence which it exercised, proved the unabated vigor of his faculties. He soon after repaired to Paris, and subsequently to Italy, where he was received with great enthusiasm by the people, and introduced by Prince Napoleon to the emperor of the French, with whom he concerted a common plan of attacking Austria in its Hungarian possessions in case the war should be carried into the interior of Venetia. This, however, was prevented by the peace of Villafranca; Kossuth, bitterly disappointed, returned to England, and the Hungarian legion, formed under Klapka in Sardinia, was dissolved.—Various collections of more or less complete speeches by Kossuth have been published in England, the United States, and Germany. Sketches of his life and career are still more numerous, but there is hardly any which can pretend to the importance of a historical biography.

KOSTROMA, a government of European Russia, between lat. 56° and 60° N., and long. 40° and 48° E., bounded N. by Vologda, E. by

Viatka, S. by Nijni Novgorod and Vladimir, and W. by Jaroslav; area about 30,000 sq. m.; pop. about 1,000,000, almost all Russians. It is traversed by the Volga, which here receives the Kostroma and other rivers. It consists of wide plains, little varied by gentle acclivities or river banks. The northern part is comparatively swampy and cold. Extensive woods abound. The soil is generally fertile. Agriculture, the rearing of cattle and sheep, hunting, and fishing are the chief pursuits of the inhabitants. Cloth, leather, and iron are manufactured to some extent. Capital, Kostroma on the Volga, one of the more interesting cities of eastern Russia, with a population of about 15,000.

KOTAH, a native state of Hindostan in Rajpootana, lying between lat. 24° 30' and 25° 50' N., and long. 75° 35' and 76° 56' E., bounded N. E. and E. by Jhallowa, Gwalior, and Chupra, N. W. and W. by the Chumbul and a part of Gwalior, and S. by an isolated portion of Holkar's territory and Jhallowa; area about 4,339 sq. m.; pop. 433,000. The surface is, for the most part, an inclined plane, sloping gently northward from the high table-land of Malwah. The soil is generally fertile and well cultivated, but the climate is very unfavorable, being intensely hot during the prevalence of the warm winds of summer, and extremely unhealthy during the rainy season. The rajah of Kotah is in subsidiary alliance with the British, and maintains a contingent of about 700 men, commanded by British officers. These troops rose against the British, July 4, 1857, and two regiments of the rajah's native army did the same on Oct. 15. The rajah kept faith with his allies.

KÖTHEN. See ANHALT.

KOTZEBUE, AUGUST FRIEDRICH FERDINAND VON, a German dramatist, born in Weimar, May 3, 1761, assassinated in Mannheim, March 23, 1819. He studied at the gymnasium of Weimar and the university of Jena. He intended to become a lawyer, but availed himself of every opportunity to acquire a knowledge of theatrical matters, and published some prose writings as early as 1791. The patronage of the Prussian ambassador secured for him employment as secretary of the governor-general of St. Petersburg, who on his death commended him to the favor of the empress. In 1785, after his marriage with a daughter of Lieut. Gen. Von Essen, he was appointed to a high judicial office in the province of Esthonia, and was ennobled, which afterward led him to write a fulsome work on nobility. His literary reputation was established by several successful novels and dramas, but injured by the publication of *Doctor Bahrđt mit der Eisernen Stirn* ("Dr. Bahrđt with the Brazen Face"), in which he attacked the celebrated poets of Weimar (Goethe, Schiller, &c.), who had declined to admit him into their society. After the death of his wife he visited Paris, on which occasion he wrote another ill-mannered book (*Meine Flucht nach Paris*, 1790). After his return to Russia, he devoted several years to writing a series of

tional attempt on the part of an English theologian to explain the Apocalypse. A collective edition of his works was published in London in 1672.

MEDEA, a mythical princess, a daughter of Æetes, king of Colchis, by the oceanid Idyia, or Hecate, daughter of Perses. She was famous for her skill in sorcery, and it was through her instrumentality that Jason, with whom she had fallen in love, was enabled to possess himself of the golden fleece. Medea accompanied her lover to Greece (see ARGONAUTS), and lived with him as his wife, but was subsequently deserted by Jason, who was fascinated by Creüsa, the daughter of Creon, king of Corinth. In the fury of revenge Medea destroyed her own children by Jason, and sent to Creüsa a poisoned garment which burned her to death. Then fleeing to Athens in a chariot drawn by winged dragons, she there married Ægæus, by whom she had several sons. Having been afterward detected however in laying snares for the destruction of Theseus, she was driven from Attica, and withdrew into Asia accompanied by her son Medus, who became the founder of the Median nation.

MEDFORD, a township of Middlesex co., Mass., at the head of navigation on Mystic river, 5 m. N. W. from Boston; pop. in 1855, 3,749. The Boston and Lowell railroad passes through this town, and a branch of the Boston and Maine leads to its centre. The town is noted for ship building. From 1800 to 1855, 513 vessels were built here, the tonnage of which was 232,006 tons, and the value \$10,449,270. The other productions are railroad cars, coaches, tin ware, leather, boots and shoes, sashes, doors, blinds, distilled liquors, bread, casks, hats, caps, cabinet ware, saddles, harnesses, and trunks. Tufts college is situated in Medford, on Walnut hill, near the boundary line of the adjoining town of Somerville. It was founded by Universalists, the first steps being taken by a convention at New York in May, 1847, and the subscriptions amounting in 1851 to \$100,000. Medford having been selected as the site of the college, the corner stone of the edifice was laid July 19, 1853, and the building finished in the spring of 1854. It is a brick structure, 100 by 60 feet, and 3 stories high. The college was named in honor of Charles Tufts, who made to it a donation of 70 acres of valuable land for a site. Beside this property, it has received from subscriptions, bequests, and state appropriations nearly \$200,000. It has small but well-selected philosophical and chemical apparatus, a mineralogical cabinet, and a library of 8,000 vols. The institution was opened in Aug. 1854. The president (1860) is the Rev. Hosea Ballou, 2d, D.D., elected in 1853, who is assisted by 4 professors. The number of alumni is 22; of students in 1860, 58.

MEDHURST, WALTER HENRY, an English oriental scholar and missionary, born in London in 1796, died there, Jan. 24, 1857. He was educated for the ministry, and in 1816, under the auspices of the church missionary society,

made a tour through India and Malacca, establishing himself in 1822 in Batavia in the island of Java, where he remained 8 years. During this interval and for several years afterward he pursued his missionary labors also in Borneo and on the coasts of China. After a residence of 2 years in England, he returned to the East, and in 1843 settled in Shanghai. Subsequently he passed 6 years of considerable labor and peril in the interior of China, and in 1856 returned in ill health to London, where he died 3 days after his arrival. Apart from his duties as a missionary, he was an industrious and intelligent student of the languages and literatures of eastern Asia, being well versed in the Chinese, Japanese, Javanese, and other dialects, beside Dutch, French, and English, in all of which he wrote. Beside a Chinese version of the Bible, he was engaged in four works of considerable magnitude and importance: "Chinese Repository" (20 vols., Canton, 1838-'51); "Chinese Miscellanies" (3 vols., Shanghai, 1849-'53); a "Chinese and English Dictionary" (2 vols., Batavia, 1842-'3); and an "English and Chinese Dictionary" (2 vols., Shanghai, 1847-'8). His remaining philological works are: "English and Japanese Vocabulary" (Batavia, 1830); "Dictionary of the Hokkien Dialect" (Macao, 1832-'9); "Translation of a Comparative Vocabulary of the Languages of China, Corea, and Japan" (Batavia, 1835); "Notes on Chinese Grammar" (Batavia, 1842); "Chinese Dialogues" (Shanghai, 1844), &c. In 1838 he published in London an interesting work entitled "China, its State and Prospects," which has been a text book with those taking an interest in missionary enterprises in that part of the world. He is also the author of an "Account of the Malayan Archipelago," "A Glance at the Interior of China," and several minor works.

MEDIA (Old Pers. *Mada*; Heb. *Maday*), an ancient country of Asia, bounded N. by Armenia, from which it was partly separated by the Araxes (Aras) river and the Caspian sea; E. by Hyrcania, Parthia, and the desert of Aria; S. by Persis, S. W. by Susiana, and W. by Assyria and Armenia. It thus corresponded nearly to the modern Persian province of Irak-Ajeme. It formed the westernmost part of the tableland of Iran, being for the most part fertile, and producing wine, figs, and oranges, and an excellent breed of horses, the Nisæan plain, near Rhagæ, being renowned in the times of the Persian dominion as supplying the studs of the great king and his nobles. The most important mountain range in the interior was the Caspian (now Elburz) mountains, the territory between which and the Caspian sea was inhabited by independent tribes; one of the principal rivers was the Amardus, emptying into that sea. Media was well peopled, originally by Turanian Scythians, who, according to Berosus, seem even to have founded one of the earliest dynasties of Babylon. In the times of Herodotus, and according to his statement, it was occupied by 6 tribes, the Buzæ, Parataceni, Struchates, Arizanti, Bu-

dii, and Magi, who are said by the Halicarnasian historian and believed by the principal modern critics to have been a kindred race to the Persians, that is, a branch of the great Aryan family. In the time of the Persian power they, or at least a large part of them, spoke the same language as the dominant race, and had the same laws, manners, and religion. On the other hand, there is great difficulty in determining when the supremacy of the Aryan element over the original Turanian or Scythic began, how far the two were blended together, and what relation they occupied to each other during the period of special Median history. According to Ctesias, the Medes revolted from the Assyrians and became independent under Arbaces about 875 B. C.; but his whole story about the fall of that empire and the death of its king Sardanapalus is now discredited, as being either entirely fictitious, or at least inaccurate in dates and names. About the same period the Medes first appear in real history, occupying the region S. of the Caspian, when the Assyrian monarch whose expeditions are recorded on the black obelisk in the British museum, made the earliest authentic assault on their independence. Thus also the list of 8 successors to Arbaces on the throne of Media, given by Ctesias, can find no credit with critics, especially as his names and dates are entirely at variance with those given by Herodotus. According to the latter, Media, having been for centuries under the sway of the Assyrian monarchs, afforded the first example of a successful revolt to the nations suffering under the same yoke, apparently in the latter half of the 8th century. The people, however, having elected no common chief, suffered greatly from anarchy until a popular judge, Deioeces, secured by stratagem his appointment as ruler of the united state (about 708), by common consent of the Medes, when he also founded a fortified capital, Ecbatana. He was succeeded by his son Phraortes, who, says Herodotus, "not being satisfied with a dominion which did not extend beyond the single people of the Medes," attacked and subdued the Persians, and with the united forces of these two nations engaged in war with the Assyrians, but perished with the greater part of his army, about 633. The authenticity of this Herodotean account of the two first Median reigns is, however, almost unconditionally rejected by the latest critical expounder of the Greek historian, Rawlinson, chiefly on the ground that the time fixed by Herodotus for the Median war of independence can be proved from the monuments to be the same in which Sargon, king of Assyria, made several successful expeditions for the subjugation of Media, which in his palace at Khorsabad also appears as a portion of his dominions. But this evidence against the accuracy of Herodotus's information is greatly invalidated by the testimony of other monuments erected by Sargon's successors Sennacherib and Esarhaddon; and Rawlinson himself acknowledges that "the condition of Media

during this period, like that of the other countries upon the borders of the great Assyrian kingdom, seems one which cannot properly be termed either subjection or independence." It would, therefore, be easy to reconcile the principal facts related by Herodotus, though not his entire account, with monumental history, by supposing his Deioeces and Phraortes to have been either half independent viceroys of the Assyrian monarchs, or rulers in parts of Media which succeeded in conquering and maintaining their independence. But, without subscribing to the opinion of the learned critic concerning the imposition probably practised on Herodotus by his Median informant, who, "desirous of hiding the shame of his native land, purposely took the very date of its subjection, and represented it as that of the foundation of the monarchy," we must admire the ingenuity with which he fixes the Median chronology of his author. (See essay iii., book i.) According to Rawlinson, the Median kingdom was probably first established about 633 by Cyaxares, the third king of Herodotus. At all events, it was probably that monarch, generally regarded by Greeks and Asians as the founder of a dynasty, who made the Aryan element, to which he may have belonged, paramount in the kingdom, after a hard struggle against native and foreign Turanian tribes. The Aryan emigration from the East had for centuries been pressing upon the Turanian populations of the regions E. and S. of the Caspian, and under Cyaxares a violent struggle of the two races was after many years decided in favor of the former. This struggle Herodotus brings in connection with the invasion of Asia by the Cimmerians, relating that the Seyths, their pursuers, interrupted the conquests of the warlike Cyaxares, whose greatest achievement was the conquest of Nineveh in conjunction with Nabopolassar of Babylonia, and spread the terror of their arms as far as the confines of Egypt, holding sway over Asia for 28 years. A treacherous massacre is said to have terminated this sway, when Media, which under Cyaxares also waged a celebrated war against Alyattes of Lydia, became the first among the nations of Asia, another empire being simultaneously founded by its Babylonian ally. "The nature and duration of the struggle with the Seythians, the circumstances of the various wars, and even the order of their occurrence, are points to which no little doubt attaches." Nor can it be absolutely determined "whether the great Median prince began his career from the country about Rhages and the Caspian gates, where the Medes had been settled for two centuries, or led a fresh immigration from the regions further to the eastward." The reign of Astyages, the son of Cyaxares, which lasted 35 years, was peaceful, but ended (about 558) with a catastrophe, which changed the united kingdom of "Media and Persia," as it is called in Scripture, into another styled Persia and Media, in which the people of the con-

queror, Cyrus, became the predominant race. The difficulty, however, which arises from the fact of a Darius Medus being represented in the book of Daniel as king of Babylon, has induced some critics to accept the relation of Xenophon, strengthened by that of Josephus, concerning the reign of a Cyaxares II., son and successor of Astyages, for whom Cyrus, his nephew, conquered Babylon, in preference to the detailed story of Herodotus; while others find Darius the Mede, not in a Cyaxares II., but in Astyages, who may have maintained a shadow of royalty under his grandson Cyrus. Both Media as a province, and its undoubtedly mixed population, continued prominent in the history of the new Aryan empire, though two great struggles for the recovery of independence, under Darius Hystaspes and Darius Nothus, failed. Many of the highest offices in the state were held by Medes; and the Scythic inscriptions on the Persian monuments prove the importance which was attached to the populations of the ancient Median provinces. The relation of the influential caste of the Magi to the Median tribe of the same name, as well as of the Scythic element of the Medo-Persian religion to the Aryan, is not yet satisfactorily cleared up. After the Macedonian conquest and the death of Alexander, a governor of the latter, Atropates, made himself independent in the N. W. part of Media, hence called Atropatene, which continued to exist as a kingdom down to the time of Augustus, while Great Media was under the successive rule of the Seleucidæ and Parthians. Both parts of ancient Media, the inhabitants of which had long lost their renown as warriors, were again united under the Neo-Persian kings.

MEDICAL JURISPRUDENCE, or the science of legal or forensic medicine, teaches the employment of the principles of medical science in the administration of law. In its relations to jurisprudence, medical learning is a branch of evidence in which the physician or surgeon is called in as an expert. The employment of medical experience in legislation is the proper province of sanitary or medical police, but with that subject the present has no necessary connection. There are traces both in the Jewish and Roman systems of the recognition of medical science in the application of laws; but forensic medicine cannot be said to have attained the dignity of a science until many centuries after the completion of the Justinian code—certainly not until anatomy was studied in the human subject in the 14th century; perhaps not before the publication of the Carolinian criminal code in 1552. The Roman law had referred all medical questions which arose in legal processes to "the authority of the learned Hippocrates." The code of Charles V. enjoined the magistrate, in all cases of doubt respecting asserted pregnancy, infanticide, the means of homicide, and in other cases of death by violence, to consult the opinions of living medical men. During the latter part of the 16th century and

the earlier part of the 17th, legal medicine made marked progress. Ambrose Paré, whom Foderé mentions as the first writer upon the subject in France, published during that time a treatise upon tardy births. Fortunatus Fidelis compiled and published at Palermo in 1602 all that was then known of medical science. At Rome, about 20 years later, Paolo Bacchia, or, as he is usually called, Paulus Bacchias, commenced the publication of his celebrated *Questiones Medico-Legales*. This famous work appeared in successive volumes between the years 1621 and 1650, and for its completeness and great learning deserves the merit of first worthily exhibiting legal medicine as a science. In France in 1609, under a patent of Henry IV., two surgeons were appointed in every considerable town to make examinations and reports in all cases of wounded or murdered persons. During this period the application of the so called hydrostatic test of Galen to cases of supposed infanticide, which had been suggested by Harvey, was discussed in several disquisitions by Bartholin (1663), Swammerdam (1677), Jan Schreyer (1682), and toward the close of the century by the celebrated Bohn, in his treatise *De Renunciatione Vulnerum*. In a later work Bohn treated of the office of the physician as expert in judicial tribunals. France produced during this time no very celebrated works on forensic medicine, but the *Doctrine des rapports en chirurgie* of Blégné (1684), and the more useful book of Devaux on the same subject, are honorably mentioned in this branch of the science. In 1722 Valentini contributed to the literature of the science the *Pandectæ Medico-Legales*. Between 1725 and 1747 were issued at Halle the successive volumes of the *Systema Jurisprudentiæ Medicæ* of Albertini. Among the more excellent portions of the work, those upon conception and utero-gestation are said to have discussed these topics with great ability. This work was followed by the *Institutiones Medicinæ Legalis vel Forensis* of Tischmeyer. The merit of this work may be inferred from the fact that it was used for a long time as a handbook in the German universities, and formed the text of Haller's celebrated lectures, which were published after his death in 1782 and 1784. The *Elementa* of Plenck (1781) and the *Systema* of Metzger (1795) are commended by writers of high authority. So too is the collection of Metzger's constitutions or opinions, many of which embody the results of his studies in mental disease as a branch of legal medicine. The *Collectio Opusculorum*, edited by Schlegel, and embracing upward of 40 dissertations by German authors on various topics, was one of the most valuable additions made during the 18th century to the learning of the science. During the latter part of the 18th century, infanticide was made the subject of elaborate research by Daniel and Ploucquet, among others, the latter of whom published an essay upon the evidences of respiration in new-born infants; and by Metzger, Portal, and Camper, of whom the last wrote upon the signs of life and birth

American hellebore (*veratrum viride*, Aiton) is likewise called Indian poke or pokeroot (see HELLEBORE), a far more valuable plant, and related to the European species, which is in high repute. The berries of the common poke are eaten by birds. Their juice has been used to give color to wines, but the practice is discounted as injurious. Some value is likewise attached to its root in veterinary medicine.

POLA, a fortified city of Istria in Austria, on the bay of Porto delle Rose, 15 m. S. S. E. from Trieste; pop. 11,000. It is surrounded by Venetian walls of the 15th century, has a cathedral, a Greek church, and 3 convents, and one of the best harbors in Europe. A colony was established at Pola by Augustus, when it was called Pietas Julia; and subsequently it became so flourishing that in the reign of Severus it numbered 50,000 inhabitants. Some of its ruins have been singularly well preserved. Of these the most remarkable are the amphitheatre, 436 feet in length by 346 in breadth, two temples, one of which was a favorite study of the Italian architects, triumphal arches, and portions of the ancient walls.

POLAND (Pol. *Polska*), KINGDOM OF, the westernmost province of Russia in Europe, situated between lat. 50° 4' and 55° 6' N., and long. 17° 30' and 24° 20' E.; area about 49,539 sq. m.; pop. in 1857, 4,789,379. It is bounded N. E. and E. by the Russian provinces of Lithuania (the governments of Kovno, Wilna, and Grodno) and Volhynia, S. by Austrian Galicia, and W. and N. W. by the Prussian provinces of Silesia, Posen, and West and East Prussia. All these surrounding provinces, as well as numerous others, were formerly parts of the once independent and powerful state of Poland, of which the present nominal kingdom is thus but a fragment. This country consists of a quadrangular territory, from the N. E. corner of which a long and narrow tract, bounded by Lithuania and E. Prussia, stretches northward. The average breadth of the quadrangle from E. to W. as well as its length from N. to S. is about 200 m. By far the greater part of the country is a plain, sinking gently toward the Baltic; only the southern regions are hilly or slightly mountainous, being traversed by the northernmost offshoots of the Carpathians. The Vistula, which flows from that mountain range to the Baltic, enters Poland a little below Cracow, running N. E. along the southern or Galician frontier as far as the mouth of the San, sweeps in a northerly and then northwesterly direction through the middle of the kingdom, and leaves it a little above the Prussian fortress of Thorn. On the right it receives the Wieprz, which rises in the S. E. corner of the country, and the Bug, which rises in Galicia and flows along the E. or Russian frontier; on the left the Nida, the Pilica, which rises in the S. W. corner, and the Bzura. The Narew, which rises in the Russian government of Grodno and receives the Bobr, is an affluent of the Bug from the right, joining it near

its mouth. The Niemen, which has its source in the government of Minsk, having traversed Lithuania, reaches Poland near the town of Grodno and flows along the Lithuanian frontier toward the Baltic. The Warta, the source of which is near that of the Pilica, and its affluent the Prosna, which partly separates Poland from Silesia and Posen, are tributaries of the Oder. Most of these rivers are navigable, and form channels for the exportation of produce through the Prussian towns of Dantzic, Stettin, and Tilsit, to the Baltic. There are lakes in the northern part near the Prussian boundary, but none of much size. The climate is healthy but severe, the summer being very hot and the winter very long and exceedingly cold. In the former season, especially when the S. E. winds blow from the steppes of Russia, the thermometer sometimes rises above 90° F., and in the latter it more frequently descends to 15° below zero. The rivers are sometimes ice-bound and the fields covered with snow for 4 or 5 months continuously. The soil is mostly a fertile sandy loam; but there are numerous unproductive tracts covered with sand, heath, or swamps. Rich pastures and vast forests abound. The region between the upper Bug and Vistula is the most fertile, that between the Vistula and the Pilica the most varied and picturesque. The principal productions are wheat, rye, barley, oats, and buckwheat; various leguminous plants; apples, excellent cherries, and other fruit; many kinds of berries, especially strawberries, which are equally delicious and abundant; pine, fir, birch, oak, ash, hazel, lime, and other forest trees; silver, iron, copper, lead, and zinc; cattle, hogs, bees in great swarms, poultry, sheep, and horses, some breeds of the last two being among the best in eastern Europe. Of wild animals the most common are the deer, fox, marten, polecat, weasel, and wolf, the last of which in very severe winters frequently infests the rural districts; among the singing birds are the skylark and the nightingale; the principal fish is the pike.—The bulk of the population consists of Poles, of whom the higher classes are generally well formed, vivacious, warlike, hospitable, and patriotic, but often rash and violent; the women are graceful and spirited, and the peasants sturdy, good-natured, but slavish. The Jews, who form $\frac{1}{5}$ of the population, and are allowed to live only in separate town quarters, are mostly poor, careless in dress, speech, and manners, but benevolent, religious, and intellectual. The Germans, who live chiefly in manufacturing towns and in separate agricultural settlements, are distinguished above all the other inhabitants by industry, economy, and cleanliness, but are little liked in other respects. Russians (except the garrisons) and gypsies are not numerous. The Poles almost all belong to the Roman Catholic church; the Germans are mostly Lutherans; the Russians have churches of the Greek rite. The main resources of the country are agriculture and mining. Commerce and the

trades are to a great extent in the hands of the Jews, and manufactures in those of the Germans. Woollen cloth, cotton goods, flannel, merinoes, shawls, hosiery, leather, paper, glass, beet root sugar, beer, spirits, iron and zinc, musical instruments, clocks and watches, and carriages are among the principal manufactures, some of which are exported to the various provinces of Russia. Grains, seeds, oil, honey, wool, metals, and timber are exported to the Baltic ports, mostly down the Vistula to Dantzic. A strictly guarded customs line protects home manufactures against foreign competition. A railroad, running across the country in a N. E. and S. W. direction, connects the capital, Warsaw, with the Russian, Austrian, and Prussian provinces. Some of the other important towns are: Sandomir, Pulawy, the fortress New Iwangorod, Praga, a suburb of Warsaw, the fortress New Georgiewsk or Modlin, and Plock, on the Vistula; Czenstochowa, Sieradz, Kolo, and Konin on the Warta; Kalisz on the Prosna; Piotrkow, Lodz, and Rawa, between the Warta and the Pilica; Lowicz on the Bzura; Kielce, Opatow, Konskie, and Radom, between the Pilica and Vistula; Lublin, Lenczna, and the fortress Zamosc, near the Wieprz; Wlodawa and Nur on the Bug; Siedlce S. of it; Lomza, Ostrolenka, and Pultusk on the Narew; Suwalki and Kalwarya in the N. E. projection. The last division of the country is into 5 governments, viz., of Warsaw, Radom, Lublin, Plock, and Augustowo (capital Suwalki), which has superseded a former one into 6 palatinates, viz., of Masovia (capital Warsaw), Kalisz, Cracow (capital Kielce), Sandomir, Podlachia (capital Siedlce), and Lublin. The present governor is Prince Michael Gortchakoff.—The Poles form one of the principal branches of the Slavic family of nations. Their ancestors are believed by the best historians to have occupied the same regions during or soon after the time of the great migration of nations. A few centuries later they appear under the name of Polans between the Oder and Vistula, of Lenczyeans E. of the Warta, of Masovians between the Vistula and the Narew, and of Kujavians, Kassubs, and Pomeranians on or near the lower Vistula, being surrounded by kindred tribes, the Obotrits, Wends, Sorabians, Lusatians, Silesians, Bohemians, Moravians, and White and Red Croats, on the W. and S., and by the Prussians, Lithuanians, and others on the E. The Polans, probably so named as inhabitants of the plain (Pol. *pole*, field, plain), formed the most conspicuous group, and eventually gave their name to the whole nation. Their leader or prince Lech, the founder of the city of Gnesen (about A. D. 550), is the first among the heroes of the earliest, that is, legendary Polish history. But, as Lach is still used for Pole among the Russians, the name of the fabulous brother of Czech (Bohemian) and Rus (Russia) probably belonged to the people. Equally fabulous are, among others, Krakus, the founder of Cracow;

his daughter Wanda, who is said to have defeated in battle a German suitor, Rytgier, whom her patriotism did not allow her to marry, and then to have drowned herself in the Vistula; and the tyrant Popiel, said to have been devoured by mice in his castle in the middle of Lake Goplo. The election of Piast, a pious and benevolent peasant of Kruszwica, as king, is also regarded as mythic, his son Ziemowit being considered the first historical ruler of Poland (860). Little, however, is known of him, or of his successors before Miecislav I. (962–992), who having married Dombrowka, a Bohemian princess, was induced by her to convert his people to Christianity. He divided his dominions among his sons, but Boleslas, the eldest of them, surnamed the Brave or the Great, made himself master of the whole inheritance, extending it by conquests even beyond the Oder, the Carpathians, and the Dniester. He was acknowledged as an independent monarch by the emperor Otho III., who came to Poland to visit the tomb of St. Adalbert at Gnesen; but he afterward carried on long wars against Otho's successor Henry II., with whom he finally concluded a peace at Bautzen (1018). Dissensions between the successors of Vladimir, grand prince of Kiev, called him to Russia, and he entered that capital in triumph, striking its gold-covered principal gate with a sword received from Otho, which was afterward known among the insignia of the Polish crown under the name of *szczerbiec* (notched). He was no less successful in peace, promoting commerce, a strict administration of justice, and the spread of the new religion, and strengthening the internal defences of the country. This was, however, still in a comparatively rude condition. The principal places were little more than small towns; most of the inhabitants were agriculturists bound to do military service; those who were able to equip a horse were regarded as nobles; prisoners of war were held as serfs; and the government was entirely autocratic. Boleslas was fond of splendor, sports, and military displays, and shortly before his death (1025) had himself crowned as king by his bishops. The reign of his son Miecislav II. was short. His widow Rixa, a granddaughter of the emperor Otho II., reigned for some time badly in the name of her son Casimir, and finally fled with the treasure and the royal insignia to Germany. Casimir followed her, and a period of anarchy ensued. The national heathenism prevailed over the imported worship; the Christian priests were murdered, and their churches destroyed. Russians and Bohemians, grasping the opportunity to take revenge for late defeats, invaded the country. Casimir, who had lived for years the life of a monk, was now recalled (1040), and by the restoration of peace, order, and Christianity, gained the surname of "the Restorer." His son Boleslas II., or the Bold (1058–81), was warlike, like the first of that name, but without his ability as a ruler. He triumphed over the Bohe-

mians, decided by his intervention the disputes about the Hungarian throne, and on a similar expedition to Russia occupied Kiev. This city, however, proved a Capua to his warriors; the war was protracted for years, and lawlessness and profligacy prevailed in the meanwhile in Poland. On his return he committed acts of tyranny, and even stained his hands with the blood of St. Stanislas, bishop of Cracow, who had reprimanded him. This roused the people against him, and he died in exile. His brother Ladislas (Wladyslaw) Herman (1081-1102), weak-minded and sluggish, resigned the regal title, being satisfied with that of duke, and intrusted all affairs of state to a favorite, Sieciech, whom he raised to the dignity of palatine (*wojewoda*), and whose sway caused general discontent. His two sons finally compelled him to banish the favorite, and Ladislas Herman died soon afterward. His son Boleslas III., the Crooked Mouth (1102-'39), warred with success against the Prussians, conquered Pomerania, converting its inhabitants to Christianity, and defended Silesia against the emperor Henry V.; but, no less passionate than brave, he took a bloody revenge on his half brother Zbigniew for repeated provocations, and died broken-hearted after having been worsted by the Hungarians, Bohemians, and Russians. By his will he divided his dominions among his 4 eldest sons, the youngest, Casimir, receiving no share. Henry received Sandomir, Miecislav III. (the Old) Great Poland (or Poland proper) with Posen, Boleslas IV. (the Curly-haired) Masovia and Kujavia, and Ladislas II. Pomerania, Silesia, Sieradz, Lenczyca, and Cracow, with the guardianship of his brothers and the title of monarch. But the harmony among the family was of short duration. Ladislas, incited by his German wife, tried to dispossess his brothers, and was deposed. Boleslas was elected monarch in his stead, but after a war against Frederic Barbarossa, who intervened in favor of the eldest line, finally ceded Silesia to the sons of Ladislas, and this province eventually became severed from Poland and Germanized. Miecislav, who succeeded Boleslas as monarch, shared the fate of the eldest brother (1177), and the crown devolved upon the youngest, Casimir II., surnamed the Just, who had succeeded Henry in Sandomir, and had subsequently also inherited Masovia and Kujavia. He was successful both in peace and war. Important reforms took place during his reign in the administration of the country. An assembly of bishops convoked at Lenczyca in 1180 established the rights of the peasants and the clergy. A senate was formed consisting chiefly of bishops, palatines, and castellans, or governors of the fortified castles. Thus the monarchy became limited by the introduction of a kind of oligarchy, which by subsequent changes was developed into a powerful aristocracy. This was in part a natural consequence of the division of the country, which brought about the appointment of numerous ducal palatines and other officers, chosen from

among the nobles. The interests of the lower classes, too, were after the death of the virtuous Casimir more and more disregarded; domains and single estates were granted as presents or rewards to favorites or public officers, with the right of jurisdiction over the peasantry; the obligations of the latter were gradually extended, while the higher nobles were exempted from all public burdens. An attempt of Miecislav the Old to recover the crown after the death of Casimir failed. The son of the former, Ladislas, was also set up as a rival to that of the latter, Lesco (Leszek) I., the White, but generously resigned (1207). Thus the youngest line of the house of Boleslas Crooked Mouth remained in possession of power. Lesco himself took the provinces of Cracow, Sandomir, and Pomerania; his brother Conrad received Masovia, Kujavia, Sieradz, and Lenczyca. Lesco, a worthy son of Casimir the Just, repeatedly interfered in the affairs of the distracted Red Russian principality of Halicz (Galicia), protecting the house of his former enemy Prince Roman against native factions as well as against the Hungarians. He then turned his attention to the affairs of his own province, Pomerania, in a part of which Sventopolk, a native governor, who had delivered the coast land of the Baltic from the Danes, strove to assume absolute power. Lesco tried to bring about a peaceful settlement, but was treacherously murdered by the Pomeranian. The province, a conquest of Boleslas III., was lost. Conrad, too, who was as rash and cruel as his brother was mild, was unable to cope with his heathen Prussian neighbors. He called to his assistance the Teutonic knights, who were not satisfied with the conversion of the half savage people, but made conquest and power their principal object, carried their arms into Lithuania and Podlachia, and soon became terrible enemies of Poland. Boleslas V. the Bashful (1227-'79), who succeeded his father under the guardianship of his uncle, and grew up to become "an unjust judge, peace-loving knight, and careless ruler," was not the man to restore the power of the state. This was almost annihilated by the great invasion of the Mongol Tartars. Boleslas escaped beyond the Carpathians, whence he continued his flight together with King Béla of Hungary; the people sought refuge in the vast forests or behind the walls of the scanty fortresses. The Mongols burned Cracow, and carried death and devastation even beyond the Oder. Duke Henry the Pious of Silesia fell with his knights on the great battle field of Wahlstatt near Liegnitz in 1241, but the invaders now commenced their retreat, pillaging, burning, and carrying off men and cattle. The decay of the country was general and gradual. The heirs of Conrad subdivided his possessions. Various western districts were pledged for loans or ceded to neighboring German princes, especially to the margraves of Brandenburg, and the Bohemians occupied parts of southern Silesia. The numerous Ger-

man settlers in the towns, though useful for their industry, extended the influence of their native country by the spread of their language and the introduction of German customs and even laws, especially those regulating commerce and trade, and almost denationalized parts of their adopted land. German warriors and adventurers flocked to the shores of the Baltic, where the Teutonic knights, pressed by the Prussians, Lithuanians, and Sventopelk of Pomerania, allied themselves with the knights sword-bearers of Livonia for common crusading wars on the confines of Poland. The Jews, too, who in the time of the crusades were driven by persecution from Germany, retained in Poland the language which they had adopted on the banks of the Rhine and Danube. Tartars, Red Russians, and even the Lithuanians, who found an able prince in Mindog, made occasional incursions. Still Boleslas succeeded in annexing Podlachia. He left the country in a distracted condition, which grew still worse during the short reigns of his successors Lesco II. the Black, a grandson of Conrad, Premislas (Przemyslaw), duke of Posen, who was crowned king at Gnesen in 1295, but soon after murdered by Brandenburgians, and Wenceslas, king of Bohemia, who was elected by the people of Great Poland as a rival to Ladislas the Short (Lokietek), a brother of Lesco II. This prince, who had saved his life once before by escaping in disguise, again became a fugitive, and made a pilgrimage to Rome, but, growing manly, steady, and resolute in misfortune, returned to Poland in 1305, was well received in Cracow and Sandomir (Little Poland), but had to struggle hard against factions in Great Poland and elsewhere, the encroachments of the Teutonic knights, and numerous deeply rooted abuses. He succeeded in restoring order and the unity of the larger part of the country (Silesia subjecting itself to the Bohemian kings); made Cracow its permanent capital, where he was solemnly crowned in 1319; reformed judicial abuses; abolished numerous illegally acquired privileges; convened an assembly of senators, chancellors, regal officers, and other nobles for legislative purposes at Chenciny in 1331, which may be regarded as the first Polish diet (*sejm*); and in alliance with the powerful prince of Lithuania, Gedimin, carried on a vigorous war against the Teutonic knights. Returning from his last campaign, the septuagenarian monarch was justly hailed as the father of his country by the people of the capital, but death followed close upon his triumphal reception (1333). "War against the Teutonic order" was the last advice of the king who had saved and reorganized Poland; peace was the foremost desire of his son Casimir III. the Great, who made it powerful and flourishing. He exchanged the eastern parts of Pomerania, which had been regained under Premislas, for some districts on the Vistula restored by the knights; ceded Silesia to Bohemia for a resignation of further

claims, and secured the alliance of Hungary by adopting as successor his nephew Louis the Great, king of that country. Humane and enlightened above his age, though profligate, he earned the title of "king of the peasants," protected the Jews, had a double code of laws for both Polands promulgated by the diet of Wislica in 1347, and founded the university of Cracow, the first in northern Europe. But he also took care to strengthen and extend his power. He built cities and fortresses, and after the death without issue of Boleslas of Masovia, who reigned over Halicz, annexed his vast possessions to the Polish crown. To defend its rights to these provinces, he fought with varying success against Tartars, Lithuanians, and Wallachians. His death (1370) closed the long reign of the Piast dynasty, the first century of which (860-962) may be regarded as half historical, the following 180 years (nearly), from the accession of Miecislav I. to the death of Boleslas Crooked Mouth (1139), as a time of growth and conquests, the 180 years preceding the coronation of King Ladislas I. the Short (1319), as a time of division and decay, and the last period of 50 years as one of reconstruction and renewed expansion.—Louis of Hungary possessed the title, legally conferred by the diet, of Polish king, but hardly deserved it, his policy remaining exclusively Hungarian. He spent all his time in his native kingdom, and even commenced the annexation to it of the Haliczian territories. The legislative rights of the nobles, however, he confirmed and extended, being bent on securing the Polish succession to one of his two daughters, Mary and Hedvig. Of these, the younger, a girl distinguished by beauty as well as piety and mildness of character, was acknowledged after his death (1382), but long remained absent from Poland, which was in the meanwhile a scene of civil war. She finally arrived, and, following the advice of the Polish statesmen, gave her hand to Jagiello, grand prince of Lithuania, conquering not without a struggle an early love for an Austrian duke. The pagan prince was baptized as Ladislas (II.), and promised to convert his people, in which he was assisted by the zeal of Hedvig, and to unite his possessions with Poland. These, the limits of which had been extended by the conquests of his grandfather and father, Gedimin and Olgerd, from the Baltic and the Düna to the Dnieper and Black sea, comprised Lithuania proper, Samogitia (N. of the Niemen), Polesia (on both sides of the Pripetz), Volhynia, Podolia, and Ukraine, and in extent exceeded the territories of Poland, though surpassed by it in population, wealth, and culture. The promised union of the two powerful states was executed gradually and with difficulty. Jagiello, acknowledged as king of Poland (1386-1434), warred successfully against the Teutonic knights, routing them at Grünwald in 1410. His cousin Witold in vain conspired with the emperor Sigismund to make himself independent king of Lithuania

under his protection. After the death of Jagiello, however, his elder son Ladislas III. was acknowledged only in Poland, the Lithuanians preferring to be ruled separately under the younger, Casimir. Both were still under guardianship. Ladislas was subsequently elected king of Hungary, and after a successful expedition against the Turks, and a favorable peace concluded under oath, which he was persuaded to break in the interest of religion, fell in a second campaign in the bloody battle of Varna in 1444. His brother Casimir IV. now reigned over both Lithuania and Poland. The first part of his long reign was mostly occupied by campaigns against the Teutonic knights, whose extortions drove the people of eastern Pomerania, or as it was now called Prussia, to rebellion, and in the peace of Thorn (1466) finally surrendered the territories of Dantzic, Culm, and Ermeland to Poland, keeping the eastern part as vassal of that crown. The Polish nobility, who by their bravery decided the protracted contest, simultaneously extended and regulated their rights and legislative privileges; the diets were organized by the institution of preceding district assemblies, and the introduction of regular representation; equality among the warrior class or nobles more and more prevailed; princely and other titles were despised, but family arms generally introduced; in Lithuania alone the higher nobility preserved their titles and oligarchic influence, and their pretensions and turbulent spirit caused numerous troubles, and even grave losses. The long wars were followed by a period of relaxation. Western Prussia, reviving after a dreadful devastation, became a great channel for foreign commerce; luxury, extravagance in dress, and refinement, and the use of foreign languages, including Latin, spread through all classes except that of the peasants. This latter class was still more oppressed during the following short reigns of the sons of Casimir, John (I.) Albert (1492-1501) and Alexander (1501-'6). The former made unsuccessful attempts to limit the sway of the nobles, and only aroused their jealousy and suspicions, an unexpected defeat in the forests of Bukovina during an expedition against Wallachia in 1496 being attributed by them to a plot aiming at their extermination. Under the latter the old and recent enactments, which had already concentrated almost all power in the two houses of the diet, the senate and the more powerful chamber of deputies, were digested in the form of a regular code by the chancellor Laski. Sigismund I., another son of Casimir IV., succeeded (1506-'48). Steady, diligent, active, and a friend of peace, he was the happiest king of his age. He was beloved by the whole people, and obeyed by even the turbulent nobility. The resources of the country were developed, and it attained an unprecedented prosperity, enjoying peace and order while almost the whole of Europe was distracted by wars resulting from religious dissensions or the ambition of princes.

The conspiracy of Glinski, an ambitious Lithuanian, however, which was baffled, involved Sigismund in a war with Muscovy, in which Smolensk was lost, though Prince Constantine Ostrogski won a brilliant victory at Orsha. A large part of the Teutonic order having adopted the tenets of Luther, their last grand master Albert of Brandenburg, Sigismund's nephew, was established, as vassal of the latter, duke of eastern Prussia at Königsberg in 1525; the western part of that country, with Dantzic, remained in the immediate possession of Poland, under the name of Royal Prussia. A peace with the Turks, who had advanced to the northern shores of the Black sea, secured the suzerainty of Poland over Moldavia. The tranquillity of the good king was disturbed toward the close of his reign by petty political intrigues of his queen Bona, an Italian princess, and the undeserved complaints of the nobility, who, having been called out for an expedition to Wallachia, assembled in the vicinity of Lemberg, about 150,000 in number, declaimed against encroachments, drew up a list of grievances, and dispersed. Dying soon after, Sigismund left the throne to his son, Sigismund II. Augustus, an inexperienced youth, who had been trained to effeminacy by his mother. But in spite of many foibles, he proved a worthy successor of his father as soon as he was delivered from the maternal tyranny of Bona, who, after persecuting him for some time for having secretly married Barbara Radziwill, finally withdrew with her rich treasures to Italy. So circumscribed was already at that time the power of the king, that the affectionate husband was nearly compelled to sacrifice the crown to his love, and saved both only by timely directing the attention and jealousy of the lower nobility, the so called "younger brethren," to the abuses and encroachments of the higher, the "elder brethren." The reform of the republic, as the state was called, now became one of the principal objects of the diets, another being the final union of Lithuania with the crown. To achieve both the king and the nobles were indefatigable in their endeavors. The Lithuanian lords, however, who gloried in princely titles and enjoyed great feudal privileges, were slow in submitting to Polish equality; but Sigismund Augustus set a good example by sacrificing his own feudal as well as hereditary rights. After the death of Nicholas Radziwill the Black, one of its principal opponents, the union was proclaimed by the diet of Lublin in 1569. Ostrogski, Czartoryski, and other powerful Lithuanians signed it. Lithuania ceased to be a hereditary possession of the house of Jagiello, but was to form a common republic with Poland, under the rule of an elective king, with a common diet and senate. The two component parts, however, the grand principality and the crown, maintained their separate titles, armies, finances, and statutes. Podlachia, Volhynia, and Ukraine were transferred from the former to the latter.

Livonia, recently conquered by Sigismund Augustus from the knights sword-bearers, and defended against Ivan the Terrible of Muscovy, remained a common duchy. Warsaw in Masovia was chosen to be the regular seat of the diet. The power, prosperity, and opulence of the state approached their height. Peace promoted commerce, refinement, and the development of literature in both Latin and the vernacular Polish, which also gradually took the place of the Russian in the Lithuanian parts. Toleration and hospitality attracted foreigners of all sects, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Socinians, while western Europe was the scene of internecine religious strifes. The population of Poland was doubled under the two Sigismunds. But, a prey to disease, and to male and female favorites and charlatans, the younger died poor in rural solitude, and without issue, the last in the male line of the Jagiellos, the happiest of all the Polish dynasties (1572). During the interregnum which now followed, the cardinal rights of the nation were established, each elective head being required to enter into a regular covenant with it and to take the oath of fidelity to the *pacta conventa*. He was bound to convoke the diet every two years, to have a permanent council consisting of senators and deputies, to respect the rights of the dissidents, not to declare war or to send ambassadors abroad without the consent of the estates, and not to marry without that of the senate. An infraction of the compact was to absolve the people from allegiance. A diet of convocation, assembled by the archbishop of Gnesen as primate, preceded the diet of election, which was held on the field of Wola before Warsaw, every nobleman having an individual and equal elective vote. The archduke Ernest, a member of the then all-annexing house of Austria, and others found little sympathy; the choice fell upon the most unworthy candidate, the profligate Henry of Valois, duke of Anjou, brother of Charles IX. of France. A splendid embassy escorted the duke from Paris, and a splendid coronation took place at Cracow, in 1574; but the effeminate prince and the hardy nation were soon heartily disgusted with each other; and after a few months, having received the news of the death of Charles, he secretly ran off to France to succeed him as Henry III. Another Hapsburg, the emperor Maximilian II., appeared as candidate, and was even arbitrarily declared elected by the primate Uchanski; but the great statesman John Zamojski proposed to give the crown to Anna Jagiello, an elderly and virtuous sister of Sigismund Augustus, choosing for her husband Stephen Báthori, prince of Transylvania, and his advice prevailed (1575). This Transylvanian was probably the ablest monarch Poland ever had. A zealous Catholic himself, he was animated by a spirit of toleration toward others, and as a patron of science and friend of education founded numerous institutions, among others

the university of Wilna, which he intrusted to the Jesuits. He reformed the judiciary, instituting independent high tribunals, strengthened the military forces of the country, secured the friendship of the Tartars around the Black sea, organized the Cossacks of the lower Dnieper as guardians of the S. E. frontier, and in a war against Russia humiliated Ivan and conquered Polotzk. His principal adviser and right arm was John Zamojski, who united the dignities of chancellor, eastellan of Cracow, and hetman or commander-in-chief. Though a favorite also of the nation, he aroused the anger of the nobility against the king by an act of extreme though just severity, the execution of Samuel Zborowski, for murder and rebellious conduct; and Báthori, who frequently made use of Hungarian troops, was suspected of aiming at the subversion of the constitution and the establishment of a strong, hereditary monarchy, when he died. He closed the period of Poland's greatest power and prosperity, which, commencing with the accession of the house of Jagiello, lasted full 200 years. The independence of Poland survived this period for two more centuries, but these were a time of almost continual decay. Sigismund Vasa, the Swedish crown prince, who by his mother was a descendant of the Jagiellos, and an Austrian archduke, Maximilian, were the principal candidates after Báthori. Zamojski carried the election of the former, but his enemies the Zborowskis and their followers declared for the latter. The hetman, however, routed the archduke's troops, made him prisoner, and compelled him to resign. Still Sigismund, a friend of the Jesuits, whose Catholic zeal cost him his hereditary Swedish crown, entered into close alliance with Austria, like many of his predecessors marrying a princess of that house. His long reign (1587-1632) was distinguished by great men and numerous wars, but by no favorable results. In his first war against Sweden, where his uncle Charles IX. occupied the throne, he lost almost the whole of Livonia, in spite of Zamojski's successes and Chodkiewicz's brilliant victory at Kirchholm in 1605. Mniszech, Wisniowiecki, and others in vain sacrificed their men and riches to set the daughter of the former, Maryna, together with the Pseudo Demetrius on the throne of Moscow; Zolkiewski, the pretender fell by the Shuiskis in 1606; Zolkiewski, the heroic Polish hetman, took the latter prisoners, and had his king's son Ladislas crowned as czar in 1610; but Sigismund, who aimed at converting Russia, spoiled the affair by a separate expedition, and all but Smolensk and Severia was lost again. Zamojski successfully interfered, at his own expense, in the affairs of Moldavia, but other powerful nobles who followed his example were made captives by the Turks. Zolkiewski conquered peace from the Turks, but fell in a new war at Occora in 1620. Chodkiewicz revenged his death at Chocim, where he closed his glorious career in 1621. In an-

other war against Sweden, when Sigismund counted, but in vain, on Austrian and Spanish aid against the common enemy Gustavus Adolphus, not only was Livonia not reconquered, but Riga was lost (1621), the Polish fleet on the Baltic destroyed, and a part of Prussia given up by a truce in 1629. In internal affairs Sigismund was not more successful; the Greeks and other dissidents complained, conspired, or rebelled, the regular army extorted its arrears by mutiny, and the royal dignity was more than once humiliated. Sigismund's brave son, Ladislas IV. (1632-'48), defended Smolensk against Russia, and regained Prussia in a peace concluded with Sweden in 1635, but in domestic concerns was not more fortunate than his father. Having by some intended reforms caused suspicion among the nobility, he had to submit to further limitations of the regal authority. The dominant class, the turbulent warrior brotherhood, now exercised its sway in every direction, tyrannically guiding the king, prohibiting superior titles, entirely excluding the non-nobles from all legislative influence, and more and more burdening and degrading the peasantry. Similar oppression, as well as religious persecution, was now begun against the Cossacks, which at the time of Ladislas's death resulted in a dreadful rising under Chmielnicki, who, aided by the Tartars, carried death and desolation into the very heart of Poland, alternately conquering and conquered in battles, extorted treaties and submitted to others, and finally subjected the rebellious warriors to the czar of Moscow. This war and defection, next to the spirit of religious intolerance which cursed the reign of the Vasas the principal cause of Poland's rapid decay, was only one of the calamities which befell the brother and successor of Ladislas, the religious and brave but fickle John (II.) Casimir (1648-'68). Some he caused himself by injustice, as the treason of Radziejowski, and the fatal insurrection under Lubomirski; but the chief sources of misfortune were legislative anarchy, culminating in the *liberum veto*, or the right of a single deputy to prevent or annul the action of the diet, internal dissensions, and the readiness of neighboring powers to profit by them, which made John Casimir prophetically predict in the diet the future dismemberment of the country by Brandenburg, Austria, and Russia. In his own reign, simultaneously assaulted by the Russians and Cossacks, Charles Gustavus of Sweden and his ally the great elector of Brandenburg, and George Rákóczy of Transylvania, Poland was on the brink of ruin; the new capital, Warsaw, as well as the old, Cracow, fell into the hands of the Swedes, Wilna and Lemberg into those of other enemies; the king was deserted, and fled to Silesia. The fortified convent of Czenstochowa, however, was saved by the patriotism of the friars; a confederation for defence was formed at Tyszowce by the Potockis, Lanckoronski, and other patriots; heroic efforts were made, John

Casimir returned, the king of Denmark proved a useful ally, and the sword of Czarniecki was victorious everywhere and against all enemies, from Cracow to Slonim, and from the coast of Denmark to the shores of the Black sea. Peace was conquered, but at great sacrifices. Ducal Prussia was definitely ceded to Brandenburg, almost all Livonia to Sweden, and Smolensk, Severia, Tchernigov, and Ukraine E. of the Dnieper to Russia, by the treaties of Welau, Oliwa (1660), and Andruszow. Poland was half a desert. John Casimir, despairing of the future, resigned, and retired to an abbey in France, where he died. Michael Korybut Wisniowiecki was elected his successor. He was the son of a commander who made himself terrible to the Cossacks in the wars of the preceding reign, but himself possessed neither distinction, nor wealth, nor confidence in his own abilities, and had almost to be compelled to accept the crown. The primate and the hetman John Sobieski openly and secretly agitated against him; and when on an incursion of the Turks, in which they overran Ukraine and Podolia and captured Kamieniec (1672), he concluded with them a shameful peace, Sobieski caused its rejection by the senate, immediately hastened to the seat of war, and routed the Moslems at Chocim (1673). Michael dying about the same time, the hero repaired to the diet at Warsaw, was himself elected his successor, returned to meet the foe, and relieved the hard-pressed fortress of Trembowla. In another campaign, however, he was surrounded by the Turks and Tartars at Zurawno and barely saved his army, ceding Kamieniec and a part of Ukraine in a treaty. At the instigation of his ambitious and intriguing French queen, he again took up arms against the Turks in 1683, when he delivered Vienna and filled Christendom with the fame of Polish arms, but obtained no benefit for his own country. Equally fruitless were his later undertakings, and he died little beloved by his people in 1696. His sons found no support at the election; the diet was divided, and two foreigners, the prince of Conti and the elector of Saxony, Augustus (II.), were elected by the opposing factions. The elector arrived before Conti, and prevailed. His friendly relations with the court of Vienna enabled him to regain Kamieniec, without a war, through the treaty of Carlowitz (1699); but his alliance with Peter the Great of Russia and Frederic IV. of Denmark, against the young Charles XII. of Sweden, proved a source of calamities to himself and the country. The Saxons fought Augustus's battles, and the Poles, who had not been consulted about the war, were little inclined to aid him. Charles, having humbled the Danish king at his capital, and routed the czar at Narva in 1700, drove back the Saxons from the Duna, marched through Lithuania, where he was received with open arms by the Sapiehas, who were just engaged in a bloody feud against other families of the grand principality, crossed over to Po-

land, entered Warsaw, defeated Augustus at Klissow in 1702, and occupied Cracow. The young conqueror preferred giving away the crown of Poland to taking it himself, and had his friend, the youthful and noble-hearted palatine of Posen, Stanislas Leszczynski, substituted for the voluptuous Saxon (1705), whom he pursued into his hereditary electorate, where by the treaty of Altranstädt in 1706 he compelled him to resign his claims to Poland. But scarcely had Charles lost the battle of Pultowa (1709), when Augustus returned, and with the help of the Russians recovered the regal crown. Stanislas joined his protector in Turkey. The following period of peace was one of public and private corruption. The nobility was infected by the effeminacy of the court, and abandoned the defence of constitutional rights; religious fanaticism not only occasionally showed itself, as at Thorn in 1721, in a bloody shape, but also legalized the long exercised exclusion of the dissidents from office; and Russian interference became permanent. A Russian army helped a faction of the nobles to establish the son of Augustus as his successor in 1733, instead of the re-elected Leszczynski, who was compelled to retire to Dantzic, where he was besieged, and thence to escape in disguise. Louis XV. of France, who had married the daughter of Leszczynski, commenced a war of Polish succession on the Rhine, at the termination of which the latter received the duchy of Lorraine, but Augustus III. remained on the throne of Poland, continuing in peace the enervating misrule of the preceding reign. During the 7 years' war Russian armies crossed and recrossed the country without opposition. Constitutional anarchy made legislation almost impossible. But already the more enlightened of the nation, seeing the depth of degradation into which the country was sunk, began to think of vital reforms. Not only was the *liberum veto* attacked by the great Piarist Konarski and others, but monarchical opinions too gained considerable ground. To transform the republic of the nobles into a regular constitutional kingdom became the scheme of Michael and Augustus Czartoryski and their friends. In order to conquer the opposition of Radziwill, the Potockis, and other adherents of the old republican constitution, they secretly sought the aid of Catharine II. of Russia, who readily but treacherously granted it. After the death of Augustus III. in 1763, Stanislas Augustus Poniatowski, a favorite of the empress, and nephew of the Czartoryskis, was illegally placed upon the throne by a confederation of the reformers, aided by Russian bayonets. The regal prerogative was somewhat enlarged. The commencement of the new reign was splendid and promising. But Poniatowski, though enlightened, good-natured, and a friend of progress and literature, was feeble to fickleness, and allowed himself to be used as a tool by the designing empress. Her ambassador, Repnin, who had an army at his disposal, became the real

ruler. He encouraged the dissidents and enemies of reform, who formed numerous small confederations, united them into one at Radom, and by force of arms compelled them to accept the guaranty of the unlimited republican liberty by Russia. To silence the indignation of the people, he had the patriotic bishops of Cracow and Kiev, Soltyk and Zaluski, and the palatine of Cracow, Rzewuski, with his son, arrested in the night, and sent as prisoners to Russia in 1767. The patriots, however, now took up arms in defence of independence and liberty, against foreign aggression and regal usurpation, but unhappily also against the influence of the dissidents. The confederation of Bar took the lead (1768), its soul being the Pulaskis (properly Pulawskis), especially Casimir, and Krasiński, bishop of Kamieniec. The struggle against the Russians, the Porte too declaring war against them, was carried on long and fiercely in various parts of the country, but only by a part of the nobles, under Pulaski, Sawa, Charles Radziwill, Zarembo, Kosakowski, Oginski, and others. An attempt in 1771 to carry off the king from the capital failed when almost executed, and brought great odium upon the confederates. Meanwhile Catharine concerted a division of Poland with Frederic the Great and Maria Theresa. The Prussians and Austrians entered Poland in 1772; the confederates, already greatly weakened, dispersed, and the dismemberment of the country began. A diet was convoked in 1773 to sanction the deed; but few of the members appeared, and these remained silent. Russia took the palatinates of Polotzk, Vitebsk, and Mstislav, and some adjoining parts; Prussia, the Polish province of that name, with the exception of the towns of Thorn and Dantzic, and a part of Great Poland on the Netze; Austria, Red Russia, a part of Podolia, and parts of Little Poland between the Vistula and the Carpathians, uniting all under the name of Galicia and Lodomeria. The old constitution with all its abuses was fastened upon the remaining territories of Poland, under the guaranty of Russia. To save and strengthen the country by reforms now became a general tendency, and in a short time an immense progress was achieved in culture, literature, commerce, industry, and legislation. The general reform of the state was the task of the double diet of 1788-'92, called the great or long diet, and presided over by Malachowski and Sapieha, which by a new constitution, first promulgated May 3, 1791, and most solemnly adopted by the king and the people, abolished the *liberum veto*, gave political rights to the cities and civil rights to the peasantry, and made the throne hereditary, offering the succession to the elector of Saxony. Frederic William II. of Prussia encouraged the reformers, and offered his aid against Russia. But the aid of Catharine II. was invoked by the defenders of the old constitution, who under the lead of Felix Potocki, Francis Xavier Bra-

nicki, and Severin Rzewuski, in 1792 formed the confederation of Targovitz against the new order of things. The Russians entered Poland; the Polish army, commanded by Joseph Poniatowski, the nephew of the king, retreated to the Bug; the arrival of the king in person was waited for in vain; Prussia proved traitorous, and Kosciuszko's glorious fight at Dubienka (July 17) was useless. After long wavering, the king virtually ended the struggle by going over to the confederation; the Russians occupied the capital, and a diet convened by the victors at Grodno in 1793 was compelled at the point of the bayonet to sanction a new division of the country. The ostensible defender of the old "republican liberty," Catharine, with her own hand drew a line on a map across Lithuania and Volhynia, taking all the land E. of it; the late ally of Poland, Frederic William, secured himself against "Polish Jacobinism" by taking the remainder of Great Poland and the towns of Thorn and Dantzic. The despair of the nation broke out in a great insurrection in 1794, for which the brigadier Madalinski gave the first signal. Kosciuszko was called from abroad to lead it as dictator, and, appearing at Cracow, hastily armed the people of the vicinity, partly with pikes and scythes, and routed the Russians at Raclawice (April 4). The Russian garrison at Warsaw, commanded by Igelström, was soon after almost annihilated by a revolt of the inhabitants under the lead of the shoemaker Kilinski; a supreme council was formed, embracing among others Ignatius Potocki and Kollontaj; Lithuania rose under Jasinski; numerous scattered detachments of troops flocked to the banner of Kosciuszko; the king was ignored. But the means of the exhausted country were scanty, arms were wanted, unanimity could not be produced, and the Russians were soon joined by Prussian and Austrian armies. Kosciuszko was defeated at Szczekociny, and Zajonczech at Chelm. Warsaw was besieged by Frederic William in person, and distracted by popular outbreaks of rage against real or presumed traitors; and though it was saved by a rising, under Mniewski and Dombrowski, in the rear of the Prussians, Kosciuszko was no longer able to prevent the junction of the Russian corps under Suwaroff and Fersen, and in the bloody battle of Maciejowice (Oct. 10) was taken prisoner. The storming and massacre of Praga and the capitulation of Warsaw (Nov. 8) followed; the Polish troops were disbanded; most of the commanders and numberless other patriots were dragged into captivity; and Poniatowski resigned his crown at Grodno in 1795, and died broken-hearted at St. Petersburg (1798). The third division annihilated the existence of Poland, effacing even its name. Russia took all the provinces E. of the Niemen and Bug; Austria those between the latter river, the Pilica, and the Vistula; Prussia all the remainder, with the capital. But scarcely had the last dis-

memberment been consummated, when the surviving patriots commenced making new endeavors for the restoration of their national independence. Secret conferences took place in the Polish provinces, and committees were appointed abroad, the principal being at Paris and Venice. Oginski and others invoked the help of France, Turkey, and Sweden, and Dombrowski succeeded in forming in revolutionized Italy Polish legions, whose bravery soon rivalled that of the most renowned French troops under the banners of Napoleon. After 10 years' glorious service abroad they victoriously reëntered their native land. By the treaty of Tilsit (1807) Napoleon transformed the greater part of the Prussian share of Poland into a duchy of Warsaw, which received a tolerably liberal constitution, and a ruler in the person of the king (formerly elector) of Saxony, Frederic Augustus. This little Polish state made immense exertions in behalf of its French ally and protector, and the Polish armies under Prince Joseph Poniatowski, Dombrowski, Zajonczech, Chlopicki, and others, shed their blood profusely not only on their own soil, as in the last war against Austria (1809), when the duchy gained a large part of western Galicia, but also in Spain and elsewhere, and especially in the great Russian campaign of 1812, which promised the restoration of the whole of Poland. This hope soon vanished with the reverses of the grand army, and the duchy itself was destroyed in 1813, after a gallant resistance by the fortresses of Zamosc, Modlin, and Thorn. Poniatowski perished in the Elster at the close of the battle of Leipsic, but the remnants of the Polish troops fought to the last with the retreating emperor, and some followed him even to Elba. The territorial limits of divided Poland were now rearranged by the congress of Vienna, which, while creating a shadow of Polish independence in the miniature republic of Cracow, naturally gave the lion's share to Alexander of Russia. The czar, flushed with victory and popularity, formed his new acquisitions, extending from the Niemen and Bug to the Prosna, into the present so called kingdom of Poland, to which he gave a constitution guaranteeing a biennial diet, composed of a senate for life and a chamber of deputies, a separate responsible ministry, an independent judiciary, a national army of 50,000 men, and the freedom of the press. Of this separated and privileged part of his vast Polish possessions the czar was the king, and his brother Constantine, its military governor and generalissimo, the virtual viceroy, Gen. Zajonczech being the nominal. Most of the surviving Polish officers of the Napoleonic armies took service in the national ranks. But the harmony between the foreign rulers and the people could be but superficial, and even so it was but of brief duration. Mutual distrust prevailed from the beginning; the opposition to the measures and projects of the

government gained strength from diet to diet; violations of the constitution grew frequent, as the more or less sincere liberalism of Alexander declined as he grew older; Constantine tortured the army by excessive drilling, and drove the best officers from its ranks and into hostility by outrageous insults; secret patriotic affiliations were formed in various Polish provinces by Dombrowski, Uminski, Lukaszewski, Zan, Krzyzanowski, and others; numerous victims of the terribly organized secret police were thrown into dungeons or transported to Siberia; and after the accession of Nicholas (1825) there could be no longer any doubt that an open rupture was only a matter of time. Nevertheless the outbreak at Warsaw, precipitated by a small band of youthful democratic conspirators under Peter Wysocki, which drove Constantine and the Russians in the night from that capital (Nov. 29-30, 1830), took both the emperor and the nation by surprise, though ensuing 4 months after the revolution of July in Paris. The whole people immediately declared in favor of the revolution, but the aristocrats took the lead with the intention of moderating its course. To this party belonged the patriotic Prince Adam Czartoryski, president of the provisional government; the old poet Niemcewicz, formerly Kosciuszko's companion in arms in America and Poland; the minister Lubecki, a man of dubious patriotism; Chlopicki, for a short time dictator (Dec. 1830, Jan. 1831); his successors in the chief command of the army, Radziwill, Skrzynecki, Dembinski, and Casimir Malachowski; and the generals Dwernicki, Chrzanowski, Bem, Uminski, Rybinski, Prondzynski, and others. The agitations of Lelewel, Mochnacki, and other democrats, in the diet or clubs, had no other result but an increase of difficulties, and finally fatal disorder. Much precious time was wasted in attempted negotiations with Nicholas; the ardor of the masses was checked by too long continued observance of constitutional and territorial limits; the peasantry was left in its degraded condition; the army increased slowly; the sending of troops into Lithuania, which was anxious to rise, was delayed until it was too late; and a powerful Russian army under Diebitsch was allowed to cross the Bug without resistance, and to approach the capital. The independence of Poland and the exclusion of the house of Romanoff having been declared (Jan. 25), a series of bloody battles was fought mostly in the vicinity of Warsaw, especially at Dobrze, Wawre, and Grochow, and at Stoczek, in February, again at Grochow in March, at Iganie in April, and on the middle Narew and Bug and at Ostrolenka in May, in which the personal courage of the Polish commanders was far more conspicuous than their strategical talents. The bravery of soldiers, of whom a part could be armed only with scythes, never shone brighter in any other contest. But the time of dearly purchased victories and glorious defeats was now over; Dwernicki, sent to

revolutionize Volhynia, had been compelled to retire into Galicia, and there to surrender to the Austrians; another corps, sent under Gielgud and Chlapowski to the assistance of the Samogitian and Lithuanian insurgents, shared the same fate on Prussian territory in July, Dembinski alone saving his detachment by an admirable retreat; the main army remained inactive around the capital, allowing the new Russian commander-in-chief Paskevitch to cross the lower Vistula on the Prussian frontier, and to advance toward Warsaw on the left bank of that river. The people growing impatient, Skrzynecki was deposed, presumed traitors were massacred in a night of horrors (Aug. 15), and Krukowiecki succeeded Czartoryski as president of the government, but the management of affairs grew even worse than before. Ramorino having been sent to the S. E. with a part of the Polish army, Paskevitch finally attacked the fortified capital, and after a murderous struggle, during which Krukowiecki negotiated, a capitulation virtually ended the war (Sept. 8). The main army under Rybinski, accompanied by the government under Niemojewski, laid down its arms on Prussian territory; Ramorino in Galicia, a corps under Rozycki at Cracow, and the fortresses of Zamosc and Modlin surrendered. Depopulated at once by the sword and by the no less frightful ravages of cholera, the country lay bleeding and exhausted at the feet of the czar, and mercy was neither expected nor exercised. Numberless patriots were sent to Siberia and other places of confinement, the private soldiers compelled to serve in the Russian army, the estates of refugees confiscated, the constitution and the laws of the country abrogated, the university of Warsaw and other principal schools abolished, the rich literary collections carried to St. Petersburg, all marks of nationality prohibited, the most rigorous censorship of the press and a terrible police system introduced, a citadel at Warsaw and other new fortifications erected, the most arbitrary measures taken to denationalize and Russianize the people, and new attempts at insurrection in 1833 and 1846 punished with the gallows. This system was continued throughout the reign of Nicholas, though at times moderated by the milder disposition of the governor, Paskevitch. The same denationalizing policy was zealously prosecuted in all other Polish provinces of Russia, Prussia, and Austria; the republic of Cracow alone preserved for some time its nationality. In the meanwhile the Polish emigrants, residing mostly in France, and embracing the most distinguished men of the nation, though split into violently opposing factions, were unremitting in their endeavors to pave the way for a restoration of their country. The democratic party, consisting chiefly of the younger generation, partook in numerous revolutionary movements in western Europe, and fomented conspiracies in Poland. The most extensive and best organized of the latter, led to simulta-

neous outbreaks in Russian Poland, Galicia, Cracow, and Posen (Feb. and March, 1846). All ended disastrously. The leaders in Poland were hanged, those in Posen, Mieroslawski and others, imprisoned, and the patriotic nobles of Galicia butchered by the peasants; the republic of Cracow, where alone the insurrection was for a short time successful, was abolished and annexed to Galicia. Mieroslawski and his associates, being saved from death by the revolution of Berlin in March, 1848, fought soon after, with hastily collected Polish bands, bravely but unsuccessfully, against overwhelming Prussian forces in Posen; Bem, Dembinski, and Joseph Wysocki commanded Hungarian armies and Polish volunteers against Austrians and Russians in 1848-'9; Czajkowski and others fought against the latter in the Turkish war; but all these efforts directly or indirectly to benefit Poland from abroad remained fruitless. At home, however, considerable ameliorations took place in the Russian Polish provinces after the accession of Alexander II. (1855), numerous refugees returned, and new reforms were hoped for, when a gradually increasing agitation and lively popular demonstrations at Warsaw on Feb. 27 and April 8, 1861, induced the new governor, Gortchakoff, after some concessions, to employ the military force, and a large number of lives were sacrificed. Similar demonstrations and more or less serious collisions took place in other parts of the country. Simultaneously a Polish diet was convened at Lemberg (April 15), Austria having been compelled by the consequences of the Italian war of 1859, and especially the new movements in Hungary, to grant constitutions to its various provinces. — Among the principal works on the history of Poland are, in Polish, those of Naruszewicz, Niemcewicz, Bandtke, and Lelewel; and of Oginski, Rulhière, Salvandy, Bronikowski, Soltysk, Brzozowski, Roepell, Mieroslawski, and L. Chodzko in other languages.

POLAND, LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF. The Polish language belongs to the north-western group of the Slavic division of Indo-European tongues. Its principal dialects, though not materially differing from each other, are those of Masovia, Little Poland and Galicia, Lithuania, and Great Poland, beside the more degenerate Silesian. The alphabet consists of the following letters: *a* (short Italian *a*), *ą* (French *on*), *b*, *ó* (soft, like Eng. *by*, both consonant), *c* (*tz*), *ć* (*tch*, very soft), *cz* (*tch*), *ch* (*kh*, Ger. *ch*), *d*, *e* (short Italian), *é* (compressed, as in *yes*), *ę* (Fr. *in*), *f*, *g* (hard), *h*, *i* (short Italian), *j* (*y* consonant), *k*, *ł* (*l*, very hard), *l* (It. *gli*), *m*, *n*, *ń* (Fr. *gn*), *o* (short Italian), *ó* (compressed, approaching *u*), *p*, *ó* (soft, like *py*, both consonant), *r*, *rz* (Fr. *rj* in one), *s*, *ś* (*sh*, very soft), *sz* (*sh*), *t*, *u* (short Italian), *w* (*v*), *x*, *y* (resembling the Ger. *ü*), *z*, *ź* (Fr. *j*), *ż* (Fr. *j*, very soft). *I* serves to soften various consonants, replacing the ' : *drób*, little poultry, gen. *drobiu*; *żyć*, to live, *życie*, life; *koń*, horse, gen. *konia*; *wieś*, village, gen. *wsi*. The accent, except in foreign

words and in compounds, is constantly on the penultimate: *rodak*, countryman, gen. *rodaka*, dat. *rodakowi*. As in Latin, there is no article: *cnota*, virtue, a virtue, the virtue. There are 7 cases of declension, nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, instrumental (*mieczem*, by or with the sword), and locative (after certain prepositions, as *w Bogu*, in God). The forms of declension depend upon the termination, the gender, and the kind, words of the same termination denoting persons, animals, and lifeless objects having in the masculine severally different forms. The gender of nouns is mostly determined by the termination. There are three genders for nouns, adjectives, pronouns, verbs, and participles, as: *Mój dobry kochany ojciec pisał*, My good beloved father wrote; *Moja dobra kochana matka* (mother) *pisala*; *Moje dobre kochane dziecko* (child) *писаło*. The following may serve as examples of the declension of nouns and adjectives in the masculine and feminine singular: *wielki las*, (a, the) large forest, *wielkiego lasu*, *wielkiemu lasowi*, *wielki las*, *wielki lasie!*, *wielkim lasem*, (*w*) *wielkim lasie*; *wielka rzeka*, (a, the) large river, *wielkiej rzeki*, *wielkiej rzecce*, *wielką rzekę*, *wielka rzeko!*, *wielką rzeką*, (*w*) *wielkiej rzecce*. The comparative degree is formed by the syllable *szy* (nom. mas. sing.), the superlative by *naj* and *szy*, thus: *stary*, old, *starszy*, older, *najstarszy*, oldest; *mocny*, strong, *mocniejszy*, *najmocniejszy*. The numerals distinctly betray a pure Indo-European derivation: *jeden* (Sans. *eka*, compare also the Heb. *ehad* and the Hung. *egy*), *dwa* (Sans. *dvi*, Gr. *δvo*, Lat. *duo*), *trzy* (Sans. *tri*, Gr. *τρεις*, Lat. *tres*), *cztery* (Sans. *tchatur*, Lat. *quatuor*), *pięć* (Sans. *pantchan*, Gr. *πεντε*), *sześć* (Sans. *shash*, Lat. *sex*, comp. Heb. *shesh*), *siedm* (Sans. *saptan*, Lat. *septem*, comp. Heb. *sheba*), *ósm* (Sans. *ashtan*), *dziewięć*, *dziesięć* (Sans. *das'an*, Lat. *decem*), *sto* (Sans. *s'ata*, Lat. *centum*), *tysiąc* (*thousand*). The verb is exceedingly rich in forms, serving to express frequency, intensity, inception, duration, and other modes of action or being. The formatives consist chiefly of prepositions and other particles, as in German, thus: *znać*, to know, Ger. *kennen*; *poznać*, to recognize, Ger. *erkennen*; *rwać*, to tear, *wyrwać*, to snatch, Ger. *entreissen*; *rozzerwać*, to tear asunder, Ger. *zerreißen*; *rozrywać*, long or frequently to tear asunder; *porozrywać*, to tear asunder to the last. *Ó* marks the infinitive, *ł* the past: *znam*, I know, *znać*, to know, *znałem*, I knew; the persons are distinguished by the termination: *znam*, I know, *znasz*, thou knowest, *zna* (he, she, it) knows, *znamy*, *znacie*, *znają*, we, you, they know. Diminutives, denominatives, and other derivatives, are abundant. Compounds are rare. The words of a sentence can be arranged almost as freely as in Latin, misunderstanding being precluded by the distinctness of the formative terminations. In flexibility, richness, power, and harmony the Polish is hardly excelled by any other language of Europe; its grammatical structure is fully

developed and firmly established, its orthography precise and perfect. The principal grammars are by Kopczynski, Mrongovius, Bandtke, Mrozinski, Poplinski, and Muczkowski (Cracow, 1845); the principal dictionaries by Linde, Bandtke, Mrongovius (Königsberg, 1835), and Trojanski (Posen, 1835-'46).—The oldest remnants of Polish literature consist of proverbs, popular songs and tales, and a religious song in praise of the Virgin (*Boga rodzica*) attributed to St. Adalbert (Sty. Wojciech), who lived in the time of the first Christian monarch of Poland, toward the close of the 10th century. The Latinizing influence of Christianity, and of the universities of western Europe, which were generally frequented by the Poles, prevented the development of a national literature in Poland during the middle ages; and all the literary productions of that period, as well as the laws of the country, were written in Latin. Among the most important of the former are the chronicles of Martin Galus (about 1130), Kadlubek (1220), Boguphalus (1250), and Martin Skrzeński, surnamed Polonus (1270), and the celebrated "History of Poland" by Dlugosz (1480). The principal centre of scholarship and science was the university of Cracow, the first foundation of which was laid by Casimir the Great (1347), and which among its teachers and alumni counted some of the most distinguished scholars of Europe, among others Copernicus, whom Poland claims as its son and citizen. The first Polish printing press was established at Cracow toward the close of the reign of Casimir IV. (1490). Among its earliest productions is the great collection of Polish laws by the chancellor of King Alexander, John Laski (1506). In the succeeding reigns of Sigismund I. and his son Sigismund Augustus, the last two of the Jagiellos (1506-'72), Polish literature was first and rapidly developed, the 16th century being regarded by many as its golden age. The poetical style especially rose to an astonishing degree of perfection. The satirist Rej (born 1515), and John Kochanowski, the great lyrical poet (1532-'84), are both called the fathers of Polish poetry. Of the two younger brothers of the latter, Peter translated Tasso's "Jerusalem Delivered," and Andrew Virgil's *Æneid*. The poets Szarzynski, Rybinski, Klonowicz, Miaskowski, and Grochowski were contemporaries of the Kochanowskis. The reformation, which found an easy spread in Poland, caused numerous translations of the Bible into the national language, for Lutherans and Socinians as well as for Catholics. Among the theologians of that age the great Catholic pulpit orator Skarga (died 1612), and the Protestant author Niemojewski, deserve particular mention. Martin and his son Joachim Bielski, in the latter part of the 16th century, wrote a *Kronika polska*, Górnicki (1535-'91) *Dzieje w koronie polskiej* ("History of the Polish Crown Lands"), Strykowski (died 1582) a "Chronicle of Lithuania," and Paprocki (died 1614) works on heraldry. Others wrote in

Latin: Orzechowski the *Annales Poloniae*; Kromer, archbishop of Ermeland (died 1589), *De Origine et Rebus Gestis Polonorum*. Szymonowicz (Simonides), an author of celebrated Latin odes, and of equally excellent Polish idyls (*Sielanki*), and Zimorowicz, his rival in the latter species of composition, flourished during the reign of Sigismund III. (1587-1632); but in the second half of that reign Polish literature began rapidly to decline. The Latin was the principal object and medium of instruction. The disastrous wars and civil strifes of that and the following reigns of the Vasa dynasty exercised a pernicious influence. Sobieski restored only the glory of Polish arms, and the succeeding Saxon rule inaugurated a period of general relaxation. During a century and a quarter pedantry, bad taste, and impurity of language prevailed. Of the better poets of that epoch may be mentioned the Jesuit Sarbiewski (Sarbiewius, died 1640), who wrote in Latin only, and earned the title of the Sarmatian Horace; Opalinski, a writer of satires (died 1655); Twardowski (died 1660); Kochowski, who accompanied John Sobieski to Vienna, and in *Wiedeń wyzwolony* ("Vienna Delivered"), an epic, sang the glory of his hero; Bardzinski; Morsztyn, the translator of Corneille; and Elizabeth Druzbacka (1687-1760), whose *Pochwała lasów* ("Praise of the Woods"), *Cztery pory roku* ("The Four Seasons of the Year"), &c., appear as the precursors of a better literary age. The historians wrote mostly in Latin: Piasecki (1585-1649) a liberal history of his times (*Chronicon Gestorum in Europa*); Starowolski (died 1656), among other works, a *Status Regni Poloniae Descriptio*; Kojalowicz (died 1677) an excellent *Historia Lithuaniae*; Fredro (died 1677) his *Fragmenta*; Andrew Wengierski (died 1649) and Lubieniecki (died 1675) histories of the reformed church in Poland. Among those who contributed most to the introduction of a better era were the brothers Joseph and Andrew Zaluski; the former, who was bishop of Kiev (died 1774), especially by the collection of a library of more than 200,000 volumes. More powerful still was the influence of the great reformer of public education, the Piarist Konarski (died 1773). The courts of the exiled king Leszczyński in Lorraine, and of Poniatowski in Warsaw, as well as the residences of the princes Czartoryski and Jablonowski, were centres around which the representatives of reform in politics, social life, education, literature, and science grouped themselves. The politically unhappy reign of Poniatowski, the last king of independent Poland, thus became in a literary point of view the most distinguished. Piramowicz wrote for schools; Bohomolee translated French dramas; Trembecki, Kniaznin, and Wengierski composed fine lyrical or descriptive poems; Naruszewicz a great "History of Poland" and an admirable translation of Tacitus; and the genial Krasicki miscellaneous works in verse and prose, by which he merited the distinction of being called the Voltaire of Poland. This purified literary

activity survived the divisions and fall of Poland. The poets Godebski Wenzkyk, author of *Okolice Krakowa* ("The Environs of Cracow"), and Dmochowski, the dramatists Felinski, Kropinski, Osinski, and Boguslawski, and the eminent historical or political writers Czacki, Albertrandy, Kollontaj, Stanislas Potocki, Ossolinski, and Staszyc, belong principally to the beginning of the present century. The most popular poets of the next following period were Karpinski, Brodzinski, Woroniecz, and especially Niemcewicz, who was also distinguished as a historian, and in his ballads (*Spiewy historyczne*) surpassed all his predecessors. He was, however, soon after himself surpassed in epic poetry by Mickiewicz, the founder of the romantic school of Polish poetry, around whom numerous young disciples grouped themselves at Wilna. To the romantic school belong most of the more recent poets of Poland, many of whom wrote, after the revolution of 1831, in exile; the Ukrainians Malczewski, author of the admirable epic "Maria," Goszczynski, Zaleski, and Padura; Odyniec, author of the drama of *Izora*; Koiak, who wrote elegiac poetry and lyrics; Alexander Chodzko, translator of Persian and other oriental poetry; Gorecki, Siemienski, Garczynski, Bielowski, Julius Slowacki, Groza, Krasinski, and numerous others. Novels were published in the earlier part of this century by Niemcewicz (*Jan Tenczynski*), Maria Czatoryska (*Malwina*, originally in French), Bernatowicz (*Nalecz, Pojata*), and Skarbek, and more recently by Grabowski, Czajkowski (*Wernyhora, Kirdzali, Czarniecki*), and especially Kraszewski. Dramas have been written by Skarbek, Kaminski, Fredro, Magnuszewski, and others, the best historical works, beside Lelewel, by Bandtke, Maciejowski, Narbutt, Eduard Raczynski, Plater, and Lukaszewicz; the most popular educational works by Clementina Tanska-Hoffmann; and philosophical works by Sniadecki, Trentowski, and Libelt. The most important works on Polish literature are by Mochnacki, Muczkowski, Bentkowski, Ossolinski, Chodyncki, Wiszniewski (*Historya literatury polskiej*, 7 vols., Cracow, 1840-'46), and Lukaszewicz (Posen, 1860).—The centres of Polish literary activity, and especially of periodical literature, are Warsaw, Wilna, Posen, Cracow, Lemberg, and Paris, the latter city as the principal seat of the Polish emigration. Warsaw, however, in spite of very severe restrictions on the press, has always maintained a decided preëminence over all its rivals, as the literary no less than political metropolis of Poland.

POLAR EXPEDITIONS. See ANTARCTIC RESEARCHES, ARCTIC DISCOVERY, and MAOCLINTOCK, SIR FRANCIS LEOPOLD.

POLARIZATION OF LIGHT, a change that may be produced in the rays of light, such that they appear to have acquired different properties on different sides, and so that they are no longer like common light in being reflected or transmitted indifferently in all positions of

the polished or transparent surfaces on which they may impinge. The subject includes double refraction, which is one of the chief means of producing polarization. The phenomena of polarized light are justly regarded as the most curious in the science of optics; but the subject has become so extensive and complex, that it can be presented fully only in the larger special treatises of optical science. See Sir D. Brewster's "Treatise on Optics" (new ed., London, 1853), and Pereira's "Lectures on Polarized Light" (London, 1854).—Common light, as that from a candle or gas flame, and in a degree that of the direct sunbeam, can, by properly presenting an opaque mirror in its course, be mainly reflected, and equally well up, down, to right or left. But a perfectly polarized beam, if reflected best up or down, *i. e.*, in a vertical plane, is totally extinguished if the mirror be then so turned as to throw it to right or left, *i. e.*, in the horizontal plane, and *vice versa*. The ray of light here behaves as if it were flattened, and accordingly is differently affected as it strikes flatwise or edgewise on the surface of a mirror or medium. There are several varieties or degrees of polarization, the names of which have been given with reference to the undulatory theory. (See LIGHT.) To account, by that theory, for the phenomena of polarization, a ray of common light must be considered as being propagated by vibrations that are transverse to the course of the ray, the particles of ether moving in curves that have the form of ellipses, and a great number of these ellipses being described at once or successively in all possible directions crossing the path of the ray. But by impingence of a ray so vibrating on a reflecting surface, or its passage through some medium, we can readily suppose the forces acting on the molecules to be resolved in some way, so that, first, all the varying elliptical movements shall be reduced to two sets of rectilinear movements, crossing each other, as well as the path of the ray, transversely, and hence vibrating in two planes at right angles to each other, when the common or heterogeneous ray is resolved into two rays, plane-polarized; or secondly, the light striking a reflecting surface may be partly absorbed or transmitted, and the part reflected may consist of elliptical movements of which the less axis has become 0, so that all have been brought into a single plane, when we have a single plane-polarized ray; or thirdly, the elliptical movements, though not rendered linear, may be brought to coincide in a given direction, giving partially polarized or elliptically polarized light; or fourthly, the resolution of the forces maintaining the vibration may be such that the axes of all the ellipses may be brought to coincide in direction, while the two axes in each become equal, when the light is circularly polarized. All the considerations from which these names are derived are thus extremely hypothetical; yet the conditions producing the various kinds of polarized light, and the results

0 2553
10113

100

101

102

103

104





SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LIBRARIES



3 9088 00862 8471